

METHODIST QUARTERLY REVIEW.

JANUARY, 1880.

ART. I.—WESLEYAN SYNERGISM AN ESSENTIAL OF ORTHODOX CATHOLICITY.

LUTHARDT: *Die Lehre vom Freiem Willen und seinem Verhältniss zur Gnade.*

SCHAFF: *Creeds of Christendom.*

DORNER: *Die Geschichte der Protestantischen Theologie.*

STANLEY: *History of the Eastern Church.*

Ἡ Καινὴ Διαθήκη.

SHEDD: *History of Doctrine.*

NEANDER: *Church History.*

HERZOG: *Encyklopädie.*

LICHTENBERGER: *Encyc. des Sciences Rel.*

How does man recover from sin? Is he active, or passive, in the process? Is his conversion a something that is simply done to him? or does he himself co-work in it? Does the responsibility for his conversion or his non-conversion rest exclusively upon himself? or does it rest upon God? Does the grace of God visit all men equally? or is it given in more abundant measure to a select few? Did the fall entirely annihilate the image of God in man? or does there still linger in depraved man *some* vitality of the God-consciousness, which may serve as a basis for his moral reconstruction?

The answer of Wesleyan Arminianism to these varied forms of a single question is thus: The fall of Adam introduced such disorder into human nature as to render it morally certain that all men, if left without gracious help, would freely fall into sin, and incur personal guilt. But this disorder, or de-

FOURTH SERIES, VOL. XXXII.—1

pravity, with which all men are born, is not to them personal sin, and hence is not punishable. It is of the nature of an inherited misfortune. Hence, if the propagation of the fallen human race is permitted at all, divine justice (not simply divine goodness, but divine *justice*) will feel bound to impart to all men a complete remedy for their hereditary misfortune. This remedy *is* furnished by the general presence of the Spirit of God, and furnished alike to every soul that is born into the world. This presence of the Spirit so counteracts the bondage of hereditary depravity as to raise every child of Adam into the conditions of a just probation, so that he is now abundantly able freely to elect between sin and righteousness, and thus to save or ruin his own soul. This impartation of the Spirit to all who are born into the world may, in an uncritical way, be called a *grace*, but only in the same loose way in which the original gift of conscience or of freedom of will might be likewise so called. *That, the non-giving of which would violate divine justice, is not properly a grace, but a simple justice.* The result is that every descendant of Adam, on first awaking to rational moral life, finds his hereditary depravity so far paralyzed as to constitute no longer a fatal bondage unto sin. He *can*, by the powers with which he finds himself already possessed, resist this bondage. It is only by the non-using of these powers that he incurs personal guilt, and thus transforms his hereditary misfortunes into a fatalistic bondage to sin—fatalistic until counteracted, upon repentance, by special *grace* properly so called. The question, What is the moral ability of the natural man? cannot, therefore, be answered without some defining of terms. The purely natural man, as he would have descended from Adam without the general gift of the Spirit, is a pure *abstractum*, a mere theological bugbear. He does not, and never did, exist. Divine justice forbade it. The only *real* man with whom theology has any thing to do is the empirical man of history. Now, with this man, the only real man, the influence of the Spirit of God is *congenital*. It is a part of the moral endowment with which he finds himself furnished on first awaking to moral self-consciousness. In virtue of this endowment he is able to choose, obey, and love God at the outset, and to ask for gracious help in the further progress of his life. Should he, however, fail to profit by his original

moral endowment, and thus fall into bondage to sin, he *may* even yet recover from his guilt and enslavement (if not persisted in too far) by accepting the special visitations of *grace*, repenting of his sins, and seconding the regenerating influence of the Spirit. He is, therefore, in either case a *synergist*, (from σύν ἐργον,) a *co-worker* with God, throughout his moral life. Such is the answer of Wesleyan Arminianism to the question or questions before us, as to the relation of man's freedom to God's grace.

Is this answer in harmony with the general consciousness of the Church catholic? Is it a heresy, a sectarian individualism? or is it an essential element of orthodox catholicity?

What says the history of theology? Let us consult the records. The results will not be without interest.

Passing over at once the testimony of the Scriptures, and simply assuming that this testimony is either synergistic or monergistic, either for or against the above-given synopsis of Wesleyan Arminianism, we come directly to the earliest Christian theology, that of the Greek fathers, and ask, How did they understand the Scriptures to teach on the subject before us?

We preface our examination by this general statement of Hagenbach, (*Hist. Doct.*, i, 155:) "Freedom and immortality are those traits of the human mind in which is manifested the image of God. Such was the doctrine of the primitive Church, confirmed by the general Christian consciousness. All the Greek fathers, as well as the apologists, Justin, Tatian, Athenagoras, Theophilus, and the Latin author, Minutius Felix, also the theologians of the Alexandrian school, Clement and Origen, exalt the αὐτεξούσιον (the *autonomy*, self-determination) of the human soul. . . . They know nothing of any imputation of sin except as a voluntary and moral self-determination is presupposed. . . . None but heretics ventured to maintain that man is subject to another influence than himself." With this statement Luthardt perfectly harmonizes. He says, (*Lehre vom Fr. Will.*, p. 13:) "The idea of man's ability to choose between good and evil is a fundamental article with all the Greek theologians. It inspires their entire system of thought." In general, the Greek fathers excluded every thing of a magical character from their conception of sin and grace. Christianity was to them not the exclusive possession of the favored few

who stood in material contact with the written word or the organized Church, but it *virtually* belonged to the whole human family, to all who at any time or in any place honestly sought the truth. The self-revelation of God is universal. Where the specific revelation, through written words or living prophets, is wanting, there the *λογός σπερματικός* (the germinal word or revelation) is given. And all who humbly heed this general self-revelation of God are blessed and accepted of the Father. It is only a later and narrower age which presumed to confine God's pardoning graciousness to the material limits of the visible Church and sacraments.

As to the *modus* of conversion, the Greek fathers as a body, and in fact the entire theology of the Orthodox Eastern Church, are very positively synergistic. The key-note of their whole system is thus well expressed by Justin (born A. D. 89; *ob.* 176) in his *Apology*, i, 10: "Though we had no choice in our creation, yet in our regeneration we have; for God persuades only, and draws us gently, in our regeneration, by co-operating freely with those rational powers he has bestowed upon us." And with this thought Clement of Alexandria (*ob. cir.* 212) fully harmonizes. "God," says he, "co-operates with those souls that are willing." "As the physician furnishes health to that body which synergizes toward health, so God furnishes eternal salvation to those who synergize toward the knowledge and obedience of the truth."—*Strom.*, viii. Clement knows nothing of a *gratia irresistibilis*.—*Strom.*, viii, p. 855.

So teaches also Origen, *ob.* 254. His central view is thus stated by Shedd, (ii, 34:) "The faculty by which to will the right man has from God; but the decision itself is his own act. God's part is, therefore, greater than man's, as the creation of a faculty is greater than the use of it. Moreover, every right beginning of action on the side of man requires a special succor and assistance from God. Through the Holy Spirit this succor is granted, according to the worthiness of the individual; and thus every right act of man is a mixture of self-choice and divine aid, (*μικτόν ἐστιν ἐκ τε τῆς προαιρέσεως αὐτοῦ καὶ τῆς συμπνεύσεως θείας δυνάμεως*.—*Opp.*, ii, p. 571.)" In the same sense spoke also Theophilus of Antioch, *ob.* 181. He strongly emphasizes man's moral autonomy: Ἐλευθερον γὰρ καὶ αὐτεξούσιον ἐποίησεν ὁ θεὸς ἄνθρωπον.—*Ad Autol.*, ii, 27.

In regard to depravity, or original sin, the Greek fathers agree in teaching that it is an inherited corruption or disorder of human nature, but not of the nature of sin proper, or guilt. Says Justin, (*Dial. c. Tryph.*, c. 124:) "All men deserve to die, because they have sinned *as Adam*," (ὁμοίως τῷ Ἀδὰμ.) Of the imputation of Adam's guilt he has no thought. Clement rejects the idea of imputing Adam's sin to his children. *Strom.*, iii, 16. Origen teaches that guilt arises only when we freely yield to the temptations to which our depravity exposes us. *De Princ.*, iii, 2. So teach also Tertullian (*De Bapt.*, 18) and Cyprian. *Ep.*, 64. The latter calls original sin *contagio mortis antiquae*, (*Ep.*, 59,) but says that it does not annul freedom. *De Grat.*, c. 2. Cyril of Jerusalem (*ob.* 386) says, "When we come into the world we are sinless, (ἀναμάρτητοι,) but now we sin from choice." He has the highest ethical notion of virtue: "There is no kind of souls that are either sinful or righteous *by nature*, but that we are either the one or the other proceeds only from free choice." Shedd, ii, 38. And with Cyril agree the other eminent Greek fathers—the two Gregories, Theodore of Mopsuestia, Chrysostom, Theodoret, and the rest. Gregory Nazianzen declares (*Orat.*, xl) children to be ἀπονήρους, (innocent.) Gregory Nyssa denies that depravity in infants is sin. *Opp.*, iii, p. 317. Chrysostom held that, though mortal Adam could beget mortal descendants, yet sinful Adam could not beget sinful descendants. "No one owes any thing to justice until he first becomes a sinner for himself," (δίκονθεν.)

Evidently the idea of imputing the guilt of Adam to all of his descendants, and then of damning a large part of them because of that imputation, is an unorthodox invention of a later age.

As to the process of conversion, the Greek fathers of the fourth century are well represented by Gregory Nyssa, *ob. cir.* 395. "With him," says Schaff, "human freedom plays a great part." He lays far more stress upon heart-purity than upon a mere forensic justification. The path to deliverance from sin is the path of ethical endeavor, of humiliation, and self-mastery. When the soul in obedience to conscience heeds the voice of God, divine grace meets the soul and leads it into self-mastery. His general view (see Luthardt, p. 18) is as follows: "In consequence of the fall the divine image in us is

marred and affected with imperfection, (ἀπώστενα.) We have from birth a tendency to sin, (προς κακιάν ἐρημία.) But this tendency does not break down our moral freedom. Freedom is of the essence of man; it is lost only when man ceases to be man. Moral freedom conditions the possibility of virtue. Take it away, and we cease to be moral agents; we could be neither praiseworthy or blameworthy. Now, freedom of will involves freedom to good as well as freedom to bad. Man is no longer a moral agent if he is unable to shun sin. But when a man has once fallen into sin, how is he to recover himself? First, under the experience of life and the guidance of the Spirit he is awakened to serious thought; he *comes to himself*. Then, when thus brought to see his real moral condition, he opens his eyes and welcomes the light, as a mortally sick man welcomes the physicians. His soul is thus filled with new light and life. The germ, the basis, of this new life lies hidden in every human being. It was not forfeited or annihilated by the fall. It is the ethical conscience, the God-consciousness. Were this lost there would be nothing of the human being left, and the regeneration of such an un-man would be a pure creation out of nothing. But does man regenerate himself? No! he *becomes* regenerate by accepting the chastenings of Providence, welcoming the visitations of the Spirit, and co-operating with divine grace."

These views of Gregory are fully shared by Basil the Great, *ob.* 379. "He teaches the co-operation of human liberty with divine grace, as the Greek Church has always taught."—Lichtenberger, *Encycl.*, ii, p. 104.

So also taught Gregory Nazianzen, *ob.* 390. He holds that the sinner is not to wait until some visitation of overpowering grace *drives* him to repentance, but rather that the grace necessary to his regeneration is congenital with him, and is ever ready to co-operate with him, whensoever he will.

Such is, also, the opinion of the great Chrysostom, *ob.* 407. "Chrysostom's theory of regeneration was firmly synergistic."—Shedd, ii, 40. "His synergism is that of the whole Greek Church."—Schaff, ii, 937. His general position is thus summed up by Neander, (ii, 659-661:) "Gregory's deep feeling of the need of redemption led him to appreciate the necessity of divine grace, while his correct ethical conception induced him to

set a high value on the free-will of man as a necessary condition of all the operations of grace." In explaining Rom. v, 19, he says: "This passage is not to be so understood, as if by the sin of one all became actual sinners; it teaches, rather, simply that the condition of human nature, which to the first man was a punishment, was thus transmitted to all his posterity. But this misfortune only redounds to man's benefit if he is not remiss in the use of his will." "If we but *will*, not only death, but even Satan himself, shall never harm us." There is no such thing as irresistible grace. Grace is effectual in proportion to our co-operation with it. God draws us to him not by force, but by our own free-will.

The next great theologian of the East, Theodore of Mop-suestia, (*ob.* 428,) stood upon the border of the great Augustinian controversy. He endeavored to keep the true synergistic mean between the fatalistic divine monergism of Augustine and the merely human monergism of Pelagius. He distinctly rejected the imputation of Adam's sin to his descendants. Man's inherited nature is not sinful, but corrupt. New-born children are not guilty of sin; hence they do not need baptism and the eucharist in order to their forgiveness. On the subject of grace Theodore held the orthodox view. Redemption extends to the whole human race. We are saved by faith in Christ, and by an obedient life. See Herzog, xv, 718. That Theodore was utterly opposed to all moral determinism is clear from the mere title of the work which he wrote against Augustinianism. It was entitled, "Against Those who say that Man Sins not by Free-will, but by Nature," (*φύσει*.) That this system was, on the other hand, not Pelagian, is thus stated by Neander, (ii, 656 :) With the Pelagians he insisted on "man's inalienable freedom, as opposed to the doctrine of a constraining grace and of predestination. But *the great difference* between the two systems was *this*—that in the Pelagian the doctrine of a redemption and a Redeemer had no foothold whatever, while in Theodore's system it had a thoroughly essential one, and, indeed, constituted the central point of the system."

Kindred to the position of Theodore was that of Theodoret, *ob. cir.* 457. He co-ordinated the operations of grace and freedom in the manner of Chrysostom, making the efficaciousness of grace dependent upon its reception and use by human freedom.

Great and original thinkers in the Greek Church appeared occasionally throughout the Dark Ages. Their theology uniformly follows strictly in the wake of the orthodox synergism of Chrysostom and the Gregories.

Maximus Confessor, of the seventh century, (*ob.* 622,) produced profound works in the spirit of Gregory of Nyssa. On the subject of grace and free-will he says: "The faculty of seeking after the godlike has been implanted in human nature by the Creator. In consequence of sin this original faculty is overwhelmed by sense. But the Holy Spirit restores it to its pristine freedom and purity. Grace alone, however, does not operate independently of the natural faculties. Nor do the natural faculties work independently of grace. The Holy Spirit guides the spiritual striving of those who are seeking after the godlike to its desired end. The Spirit works not wisdom without a mind which is susceptible of it; nor knowledge without a recipient reason; nor faith without a rational conviction in the receiver; in a word, it produces no charisma whatever without the recipient faculty of each. The grace of the Spirit destroys not in the least the natural faculty, but much rather makes that faculty which has become inapt by unnatural use once more efficient by employing it conformably to its nature, when it leads it to the contemplation of the godlike."—Neander, iii, 172-3. From Palmer's account of Maximus (*Herzog*, xx, 136-7) we further cite: "In regard to depravity, Maximus is true to the orthodox Greek view. Moral freedom, (*τὸ αὐτεξούσιον*), as a constituent element of spiritual rationality, was not forfeited by the fall. This freedom is the principle of sin on the one hand, and the basis of redeemableness on the other. It is the element which receives and co-operates with regenerating grace."

Greatest among the later Greek theologians was John of Damascus, *ob.* 754. His *Ἐκδοσις ἥς πίστεως* is one of the ablest and most systematic dogmatics which the Church had yet produced. In his soteriology he lays great stress on the rôle of human freedom. God made man innocent by nature, and autonomous (free) as to his will: *Ἐποίησε δὲ αὐτὸν φύσει ἀναμάρτητον καὶ θελήσει αὐτεξούσιον*.—ii, c. 12. The source of sin is not in man's nature, but in his volition: *Οὐκ ὡς ἐν τῇ φύσει τὸ ἁμαρτάνειν ἔχοντα, ἐν τῇ προαιρέσει δὲ μᾶλλον*. Man has the power

to continue and to advance in the good, co-operating with God's grace; as, also, to turn away from the right, and to become involved in evil, God permitting it in the interest of human freedom: Ἐξουσίαν ἔχοντα μένειν καὶ προκόπτειν ἐν τῷ ἀγαθῷ, τῇ θείᾳ συνεργούμενον χάριτι; ὥσαύτως καὶ τρέπεσθαι ἐκ τοῦ καλοῦ, καὶ ἐν τῷ κακῷ γινέσθαι τοῦ θεοῦ παραχωροῦντος διὰ τὸ αὐτεξούσιον. For virtue is not a something that can be externally compelled: Οὐκ ἀρετὴ γὰρ τὸ βίᾳ γινόμενον. Man, being a rational being, rules over his nature rather than being ruled by it: Ὁ θεὸς ἀνθρώπος, λογικὸς ὢν, ἄγει μᾶλλον τὴν φύσιν ἢ περ ἄγεται. It is God's will neither that sin should exist, nor that human holiness should be the fruit of a merely divine efficiency: Οὐ γὰρ θέλει τὴν κακίαν γίνεσθαι, οὐδὲ βιάζεται τὴν ἀρετήν. Thus is amply confirmed the statement of Hagenbach, as to this great theologian, (ii, 13:) "He every-where retained the principal definitions of the earlier Greek theologians concerning human *liberty*."

The views of John of Damascus were fully shared by all the eminent Greek theologians of the later Middle Ages: by Theodore Studita, (*ob.* 826,) Theophylact, (*ob. cir.* 1107,) Euthymius Zigabanus, (*ob. cir.* 1118,) Nicetas Choniates, (*ob. cir.* 1206,) and Nicolas of Methone. Euthymius, one of the best minds of the twelfth century, thus expresses the inefficaciousness of human effort without divine grace, and also the fruitlessness of grace without the co-operation of man's will: Μέγα δόγμα μανθάνομεν, ὥς ὅτε ἀνθρωπίνη προθυμία κατορθοῖ τι χωρὶς τῆς θείας βοήθειας, ὅτε θεία βοήθεια κέρδος φέρει χωρὶς ἀνθρωπίνης προθυμίας.—Herzog, iv, 250. Nicolas of Methone had even more eminent abilities than Euthymius. "He laid great stress on the freedom of the will."—Hagenbach, ii, 26.

As to the formal symbols of the Greek Church, they uniformly reflect the views of the above-mentioned great orthodox theologians: the Gregories, Chrysostom, John of Damascus, etc. These symbols embrace, 1. The decisions of the first seven Œcumenical Councils, (from A. D. 325 to 787;) 2. Certain extended confessions of modern times, framed in antagonism to Romanism and Protestantism. The decisions of the first seven councils are held in common with the Romish Church. They relate chiefly to the doctrines concerning God. So far as they are anthropological they reflect the Greek view. Of the later confessions we mention the following:

1. "The Orthodox Confession of the Catholic and Apostolic Eastern Church." Drawn up by Mogilas, (*ob.* 1647,) in 1640 it was sanctioned by a synod of the Greek and Russian clergy in 1643. It was then signed by the four Eastern Patriarchs. It is the fundamental creed of the whole Greek and Russian Church. On the subject of depravity and regeneration this confession teaches thus, (Schaff, *Creeds*, ii, 304-8:) God co-operates with our good acts, yet in such a manner as not to force our free-will. Though all are born with a depraved nature, yet each one can, by his will and choice, (*θέλῃσιν καὶ προαίρεσιν*,) through the use of grace, become a holy seed, or the contrary. Whether we are actually the children of God or of the devil depends upon ourselves; yet in this sense, that in our spiritual life divine grace co-operates with us, (*ἡ θεία χάρις συμβοηθεῖ*,) though without forcing our wills.

2. The so-called "Confession of Dositheus" was sanctioned in 1672 by the most important Eastern synod of modern times. It was signed by the Patriarch Dositheus and sixty-eight Oriental Bishops and ecclesiastics. We cite from it the following affirmations: "God has predestinated to glory those who he foresaw would make good use of their free-will in accepting salvation, and has condemned those who would reject it, (*Καλῶς [or κακῶς] τῷ ἀντεξουσίῳ χρησομένων*.) [See Schaff, ii, 403.] But our free-will needs always the assistance of grace, which is amply given to all men. Those who oppose this view, and teach an unconditional predestination, are impious and blasphemous heretics. They insult God, and make him the author of monstrous cruelty. We lay upon them an eternal anathema, and declare them worse than infidels. God foresees and permits (but does not foreordain) evil, and he overrules it for good. The fall did not destroy man's free-will, (*τὸ ἀντεξούσιον*.) Good works done without faith cannot contribute to our salvation; only the works of the regenerate, done *under* grace and *with* grace, are perfect."

3. The "Larger Catechism of the Orthodox Catholic Eastern Church." This is the most authoritative standard of the Russian Church. It was adopted in 1839, and is very comprehensive. We cite as follows: "God has predestined to give to all men, and has actually given to them, preparatory grace and means sufficient for the attainment of happiness." "As

God foresaw that some would use well their free-will, but others ill, he accordingly predestined the former to glory, while the latter he condemned." "Was it for us all, strictly speaking, that Jesus Christ suffered? For his part he offered himself as a sacrifice strictly for all, and obtained for all grace and salvation; but this benefits only those of us who, for their parts, of their own free-will, have fellowship in his sufferings, being made conformable unto his death."

This brings us to the close of the stream of Greek orthodoxy. As to the question before us, the result is unmistakably clear: The great Oriental Church has taught from the beginning that in the process of regeneration, it is necessary that the human spirit and divine grace shall co-operate; and it has understood this co-operation, this synergism, substantially in the sense in which Arminius and John Wesley afterward taught it. Arminius and Wesley's view of the rôle of human freedom is no theological novelty, but is a correct reflection of the orthodox catholic consciousness as represented by the entire stream of Greek dogmatic thought. The Orthodox Oriental Church (embracing at least eight millions of the Christian population of the world) is *synergistic*.

How will it result with our examination of the other, the Western, stream of theological development? Is the Latin Church (with its modern offshoot, Protestantism) *synergistic* or *monergistic*? Is its general theological drift better reflected by John Calvin or by James Arminius?

Let us examine the records. We have already seen that the earliest Christian writers of the one common Church are very distinct in their recognition of the moral autonomy of man, and that this recognition was equally positive throughout the history of Greek Christian orthodoxy. Turning now to the beginnings of a distinctive Latin Christianity, we meet, first, with Irenæus, *ob.* 202. "Irenæus," says Dr. Schaff, "cannot conceive of man without the two separate predicates of intelligence and freedom." He insists that souls cannot be good or bad by mere nature, (*φύσει ἀγαθαί καὶ πονηραὶ ψυχαί.*) Man is free, and is himself the cause of the good or the ill outcome of his life: "Liber in arbitrio factus et suae potestatis ipse sibi causa est, ut aliquando quidem frumentum, aliquando autem palea fiat." At the same time he insists that in fallen man

grace must co-operate with man's freedom. See Luthardt, 16: Hagenbach, i, 157.

Next we come to Tertullian, *ob. cir.* 220. His conception of regeneration is strictly ethical: "Fiant, non nascuntur Christiani." The image of God is not destroyed by the fall. Christianity meets a response from man's innate God-consciousness, ("anima naturaliter Christiana.") Even fallen man retains his moral freedom, (τὸ ἀντεξούσιον.) Moral freedom is not so much extinguished as hampered: "Quod a Deo est, non tam extinguitur quam obumbratur."—*De Anima*, 41. Grace transforms man only in co-operation with his freedom. Moral freedom, rightly used, constitutes a receptivity for grace, a possibility of faith.

Cyprian (*ob.* 258) was no less a synergist than Tertullian. The reception of grace presupposes faith: "Quantum fidei capacis afferimus, tantum gratiæ inundantis haurimus." And faith is not God's act, but man's: "Credendi vel non credendi libertas in arbitrio forita."—*Testim.*, iii, 54.

So taught also Hilary, *ob.* 268. The incipency of the new life lies in ourselves: "Incipiendi a nobis origo est." It is of the essence of freedom that it acts of itself: "Voluntas nostra hoc proprium ex se habere debet, ut velit." God co-operates with our efforts: "Incipienti incrementum dabit." This moral significance or value of regeneration lies in the fact that it is not simply a thing done *to* us, like our creation, but one in which *we* have a part from the very start: "Meritum adipiscendæ consummationis est ex initio voluntatis." God helps us on condition of our being willing: "Volentes adjuvet, incipientes confirmet, adeuntes recipiat; ex nobis autem initium est." See Luthardt, 24.

Ambrose (*ob.* 398) laid greater stress than Hilary on preventive grace, but was very positively synergistic. "We begin," says he, "our return to God, but we do not begin without God. The Sun of Righteousness wills that we turn toward it; and it is *ready* upon our turning." "Both Ambrose and Hilary teach the synergistic theory." Shedd, ii, 49.

Jerome (*ob.* 419) was synergistic. Man has the ability of good or of evil; which he actually does depends on his free choice. He stands between the two: "Inter hoc jurgium media anima constitit, habens in sua potestate bonum et malum

velle et nolle."—*Ad Gal.*, iii. Original sin is not guilt, but inherited disorder. From this disorder springs the necessity of prevenient grace. In order to salvation grace and freedom must co-operate: "Quamvis enim propria voluntate ad Deum revertamus, tamen nisi ille nos traxerit et cupiditatem nostram suo roboraverit praesidio, salvi esse non poterimus."—*In Jerem.*, i, 3. Predestination is conditioned on foreknowledge of man's free conduct.

We now come to the first noteworthy dissent from the catholic orthodox view of the relations of grace and freedom. Augustinianism is an innovation of the fifth century. But for more than half of his lifetime Augustine himself (*ob.* 430) held the orthodox catholic synergistic view. In 387 (at the age of 33) he held that it is by our free act of faith that we are cleansed from sin: "Peccatores credere jubentur, ut a peccatis credendo purgentur." A moral act of the will constitutes the reason why God justifies the one and not the other: "Praeedit aliquid in peccatoribus, quo, quamvis nondum sint justificati, digni efficiantur justificatione." A divine call (*vocatio*) turns man's attention to his need of salvation; but this *vocatio* becomes effectual only through the mediation of the will.

In his work on the will (A. D. 390) Augustine teaches thus: Despite all the weakness of the sinner, he has got the ability to pray, to ask, to strive. God opens to those who knock. Man is honored with the ability to seek rightly after salvation: "Tantum illi praestitit dignitatis, ut in ejus etiam potestate poneret, si vellet ad beatitudinem tendere." In commenting on Romans he says: "It is nowhere said that *God* believes all things in us. Our faith, therefore, is our own." "God gives his Spirit to one who he foreknows will believe."

About the time of his episcopal consecration (396) Augustine (at the age of 42) is thrown out of accord with catholic doctrine by the reaction of his opposition to Pelagianism. In combating undue freedomism he is led to extinguish moral freedom altogether. Two other factors helped to drive him to this extreme; namely, the remnants of his previous Manicheism and a physical conception of the action of grace. These influences were seen in his tractate, *Ad Simplicianum*. He here abandons the ethical character of the *vocatio* which God sends to sinners. The *vocatio* is now not the *occasion* of our

faith, but the *efficient cause* of it, ("vocatío est effectrix bonae voluntatis.") This physical conception of grace landed Augustine necessarily in the non-catholic, unorthodox view of a particularistic predestination. If the *vocatío* is *per se* effective of faith, and if the mass of men do not have faith, then, of course, the *vocatío* is given only to particular individuals—the elect.

Pelagius, ignoring the deep significance of the fall, had taught not only that our freedom enables us to initiate a holy life, ("possibilitas bonae actionis a Deo creatore insita,") but also that all the grace we need consists in simple instruction. Augustine did not correct this by holding that the downward force of universal depravity needs to be counteracted—and *is* counteracted—by an equally universal prevenient grace, (a grace which is only by accommodation termed *grace* at all, inasmuch as it is called for by the mere *justice* of God,) so that by this prevenient owed grace all men are now in fact able to co-work with the calling Spirit, and thus inaugurate holy lives; but he went to the opposite error, denied that the counteraction of depravity is a debt of divine justice, and held that this counteraction, wherever wrought, gives to us not only the ability to initiate a holy life, but also actually produces that life. Thus Augustinianism and Pelagianism are simply two equal heresies, each equally distant from the catholic doctrine, and each containing that half of the whole truth which the other suppressed. The true half of Pelagianism is its defense of the moral autonomy of man; its false half is its suppression of grace. It is a monergism of *man*. The true half of Augustinianism is its emphasizing the necessity of grace; its false half is its suppressing the moral autonomy of man. It is a monergism of *God*. The catholic view rejects the two errors and embraces the two truths. The catholic doctrine is not monergism but synergism. Neither God nor man, grace nor freedom, is to be suppressed; but grace and freedom co-operate.

The error of Pelagius tends to an insipid deism, that of Augustine to pantheism.

Another error which Augustine introduced into theology was that of a double, namely, a secret and revealed, will in God, the one not always harmonizing with the other. It came about thus: The Gospel is full of invitations to all men to come to God. But the grace of coming to God is not given to all.

Hence the expressed will of God is not identical with his real will. Some are called effectually : these God intended to save. Some are not so called : these God intended not to save. This monstrous dualistic self-contradiction in God the catholic orthodox Church has constantly condemned and rejected.

Anti-catholic consequences of Augustinianism are : 1. The damnation of unbaptized infants. They are damned in virtue of the imputation of Adam's guilt to all of his descendants. See Shedd, ii, 88. But this damnation is of a mitigated character : "Potest recte dici, parvulos sine baptismo de corpore exeuntes in damnatione omnium mitissima futuros." "Quis dubitaverit parvulos non baptizatos, qui solum habent originale peccatum, nec ullis propriis aggravantur, in damnatione omnium levissima futuros." See Schaff, ii, 836. 2. Another consequence is the damnation of the whole mass of the Gentile world. Even the virtues of a Socrates or a Lucretia are but masked sins, *splendida vitia*, and they can only serve to mitigate their damnation—"ut mitius puniantur."

During the lifetime of Augustine the potency of his personality made a profound impression in favor of his system. Soon after his death, however, the orthodox consciousness discarded more or less positively the uncatholic notions which he had taught. The predominant drift of catholic theology after Augustine assumed a mediate position between Augustine and Pelagius, sometimes inclining rather toward the one, and then toward the other.

Predestinarian writers are fond of stigmatizing this tendency as semi-Pelagian. It would be equally correct, however, to call it semi-Augustinian. And neither term can justly be regarded as a stigma. The fact is, the post-Augustinian orthodoxy is simply the catholic synergism which had been catholic from the beginning.

Among those who reasserted the Greek anthropology against Augustine was Cassian, (*ob.* 440.) Said Cassian : Man's depravity is not an extinction of all desire for the good. Man is conscious of his moral bondage, and he can and should seek after salvation—"velle sanari, quaerere medicum." The seeds of all holiness are sown by God in the souls of all men ; but without the help of grace we cannot develop them : "Dubitari non potest, inesse quidem omnia animae naturaliter virtutum semina

beneficio Creatoris inserta, sed nisi haec opitulatione Dei fuerint excitata, ad incrementum perfectionis non poterunt pervenire." So taught Cassian. His neglect to refer very emphatically to universal prevenient grace as counteractive of depravity has given pretext for accusing him with leaning toward Pelagianism. But in fact he taught in the same way as Chrysostom and the Gregories.

Cassian was warmly opposed by Prosper, (*ob. cir.* 455,) who endeavored to induce Pope Cœlestin to condemn Cassian. But the papal brief was quite unsatisfactory. It entirely omitted Augustine's irresistible grace.

Much less Augustinian than Prosper was the author (perhaps Pope Leo the Great) of the work *De Vocatione Gentium*. This work teaches thus: There is no particularistic predestination; God wills the salvation of all; grace is universal, but not dynamic (*violenta*) in action; human freedom has some co-operative influence in conversion. These views are insisted on without giving up some of the harsh features of Augustine.

Faustus of Rhegium (*ob. cir.* 493) stood between Cassian and Leo. He taught the universality of grace, the co-operation of freedom with grace, and the possibility of Gentile salvation—"lege naturae, quam Deus in omnium cordibus scripsit in spe adventus Christi." "The efficaciousness of grace," said Faustus, "depends upon the free-will of man."

The provincial synod of Orange, A. D. 529, gave its sanction to a very mild Augustinianism. It decreed as follows: "Grace is not merely bestowed when we pray for it, but grace itself causes us to pray for it; the disposition to believe is effected by grace; the free-will, weakened in Adam, can only be restored through the grace of baptism; when man sins, he does his own will; when he does good he executes the will of God, yet voluntarily; through the grace of God all may save their souls; none are predestinated to sin; without prevenient grace none can love God."

These articles of Orange, though so mildly expressed, are intended to antagonize the orthodox synergism of the Eastern Church, and of the whole Church before Augustine. Their fatal unorthodox point is the dynamic character of grace: prevenient grace is the *cause* of faith.

It was but a momentary victory. The milder views of Cas-

sian and Faustus—the same as those of Chrysostom—maintained their position, and were, in fact, the faith of the subsequent centuries. Let us now follow the course of catholic thought down to the next Augustinian disturbance in the Gottschalk controversy of the ninth century.

Under the influence of Faustus the innovations of Augustine had been condemned at two provincial synods—at Arles, in 472, and at Lyons, in 475. In the wake of these synods followed a succession of able theologians—Arnobius, Gennadius, Ennodius, Vincent of Lerinum—who maintained the orthodox synergism of the earlier Church.

The most prominent name in the following century is Gregory the Great, *ob.* 604. His system is partially Augustinian, but it contains elements which imply synergism. Among his positions are these: The good which we do is a joint product of grace and of the freed will: “Bonum quod agimus et Dei est, et nostrum: Dei, per praevenientem gratiam; nostrum, per obsequentem liberam voluntatem.” Grace can be lost. There is no absolute decree. Grace is prevenient and also subsequent. Prevenient grace operates, but also co-operates. Subsequent grace *helps* us to succeed—“ne inaniter velimus, sed possinaus implese.” Wesleyan synergism is but a repetition of these sentiments.

In the path of Gregory followed Isidore of Seville, *ob.* 636. He holds thus: Prevenient grace makes the new life possible. “Before the gift of grace there is in man a free-will, but not a will efficient to good.” But Isidore’s system is not self-consistent.

How little the Latin Church held to the Augustinian innovations upon the old orthodoxy is evident from the suddenness with which the fatalistic predestinarian views of Gottschalk disappeared after his death. Gottschalk (*ob.* 868) taught as follows: There is a twofold predestination: “Gemina est prae-destinatio, sive electorum ad requiem, sive reproborum ad mortem.” Christ did not die for all. Baptism washes out depravity; but only the elect among the baptized will really be saved. The fall of man did not come about by man’s free-will, but was a part of God’s absolute decree, by which the whole drama of history was arranged beforehand.

These views of Gottschalk raised a storm of opposition.

They violated the catholic Christian consciousness. They were at once opposed by Rabanus Maurus, Archbishop of Mayence, (*ob.* 856,) who affirmed that predestination was based on foreknowledge, that Christ died for all men, and that God would that all should be saved. How repulsive to the Christian public the views of Gottschalk were is plain from this statement of Rabanus to Hincmar, (see Hagenbach, ii, 57 :) "Notum sit dilectioni vestrae, quod quidem gyrovagus monachus; nomine Gotescale, qui se asserit sacerdotem in nostra parochia ordinatum, de Italia venit ad nos Moguntiam, novas superstitiones et noxiam doctrinam de praedestinatione Dei introducens et populos in errorem mitteus; dicens quod praedestinatio Dei, sicut in bono, sic ita et in malo, at tales sint in hoc mundo quidam, qui propter praedestinationem Dei, quae eos cogat in mortem ire, non possint ab errore et peccato se corrigere, quasi Deus eos fecisset ab initio incorrigibilis esse, et poenae obnoxios in interitum ire."

Gottschalk's views were condemned by the Synod of Mayence in 848, and by that of Quiercy in 849. By the influence of Hincmar a second synod of Quiercy in 853 affirmed that election is conditioned upon foreknowledge, that the freedom of will lost in Adam is restored in Christ, that Christ died for all, and that God willed the salvation of all.

A few dissident bishops in vain opposed these positions in synods at Valence and at Langres, (859.) The revival of Augustinianism was but of spasmodic duration. The catholic consciousness would not, and never did, give up these sentiments, (affirmed at Quiercy in 853,) to wit: "Homo libero arbitrio male utens peccavit et cecidit. Deus elegit secundum praescientiam suam. Perituros non praedestinavit ut perirent. Libertatem arbitrii quam in primo homine perdidimus, per Christum recepimus. Et habemus liberum arbitrium ad bonum, praeventum et adjutum gratia; et habemus liberum arbitrius ad malum, desertum gratia. Deus omnes homines sine exceptione vult salvos fieri, licet non omnes salventur."

From Hincmar we pass now to the next great exponent of catholicity, Peter Lombard, *ob. cir.* 1160. Lombard is an earnest defender of the *ethical* nature of the religious life. He holds that faith, though assisted by prevenient grace, is an act not of God but of man, and that this act is pleasing to

God, and is rewarded by God by richer gifts of grace. He says, (*Sent., lib. ii, d. 27* :) "Actus nostri sunt meritorii in quantum procedunt ex libero arbitrio moto a Deo per gratiam. Unde omnis actus humanus, qui subicitur libero arbitrio, si sit relatus in Deum, potest meritorius esse. Ipsum autem credere est actus intellectus assentientis veritati divinae ex imperio voluntatis a Deo motae per gratiam : et sic subjacet libero arbitrio in ordine ad Deum : unde actus fidei potest esse meritorius—si tamen adsit caritas."

In Anselm (*ob.* 1109) there is a partial leaning toward Augustine. Nevertheless, he held it as absurd to say that man is free to evil but not free to good, ("non esse liberum arbitrium nisi ad mala.") He endeavored to maintain freedom of will without giving up predestination. The beginning of a holy life presupposes *prevenient* grace ; its continuance, *attending* grace. Anselm makes no use of merely formal freedom, therein agreeing with Augustine.

Bernard (*ob.* 1153) taught that freedom of will remains after the fall. It is real, though feeble—"etsi miserum, tamen integrum." To will (*velle*) is present, but to accomplish (*posse*) is lacking. Here is the need of grace. In this Bernard agrees with Lombard, who says : "Dei gratiam non advocat hominis voluntas vel operatio, sed ipsa gratia voluntatem praevenit praeeparando ut velit bonum, et praeeparatam adjuvat ut perficiat." Thus, though man is free, yet without grace he cannot free himself from the bondage of depravity. This brings us back to the true catholic view, which has prevailed, on the whole, from the beginning.

The slightly wavering course of Anselm was followed by Hugo, St. Victor, Alexander Hales, Albertus Magnus, Thomas Aquinas, and some others. These all insist, however, on the moral autonomy of man, and thus defend the original and permanent catholic view in a manner which Augustine would have condemned ; but yet they retained the use of the Augustinian phraseology on the subject of foreknowledge and predestination, and vainly endeavored to explain the latter into consistency with the former.

St. Victor (*ob.* 1141) says : "We must distinguish from each other the act of willing in itself and the direction of the will to a particular object. Willing in itself is purely the act of

man; but as soon as it directs itself to particular objects it finds itself limited by the divine order of the world, so that it can take only the direction where the way has been left open for it by the latter." Before his fall man was equally able to sin or not to sin, "*posse peccare et posse non peccare.*" After the fall, and without grace, he can only sin, "*posse peccare et non posse non peccare.*" By the aid of prevenient grace he can sin or not sin, "*posse peccare et posse non peccare.*" In the state of Christian sanctification he has risen above the liability to sin, "*posse non peccare et non posse peccare.*" With such essentially catholic synergistic views the retention of predestination could manifestly be but an empty phraseology.

Alexander Hales (*ob.* 1245) says: "God's foreknowledge is all-embracing, and yet man's acts are truly free and contingent. Free-will and destination stand in no contradiction to each other: *Ipsium liberum nostrum arbitrium est una causarum secundum ejus ordinationem ad suos effectus currit series fati.*" With these views of Hales Albertus Magnus fully coincides. He distinctly holds that human volition is a true *cause*.

Thomas Aquinas, (*ob.* 1274,) though seriously entangled in the innovations of Augustine, yet constantly repels the unethical consequences of that system. He assigns a positive value to the free-will of man. Says Shedd, (ii, 312:) Aquinas "teaches that the remission of sin depends *to a certain extent* upon the character and conduct of the individual." Thus Aquinas is a synergist.

Bonaventura (*ob.* 1274) speaks of predestination, but bases it in God's foreknowledge of the free conduct of man: "*Praescientia includit in cognitione liberum arbitrium et ejus co-operationem et vertibilitatem.*" This is the uniform catholic view.

Duns Scotus (*ob.* 1308) is no longer hampered by the novelties of Augustine. He thoroughly safeguards man's moral autonomy. In the will we are to distinguish between *potentia* and *habitus*, between formal freedom and determined freedom. The latter is generated by the action of the former, and not the converse, as Augustine taught; otherwise, freedom would be compromised. Conformity to the will of God, as effected by man in co-operation with grace, constitutes a fitness for

heavenly reward. Predestination is contingent. It in no way binds the freedom of man.

The tendency of Duns Scotus in respect to man's moral autonomy was the prevailing one in the following centuries.

We pass at once to the last of the scholastics, Gabriel Biel, *ob.* 1495. Biel taught that inherited depravity is not *per se* positive, damnable sin. It is a defect, ("carentia iustitiae originalis.") Man, though free, is yet unable without assisting grace ("gratia gratum faciens") to lead a God-pleasing life. It is only by the co-operation of grace and our own moral nature that rewardable virtue ("bonum meritorium") is possible. Biel went so far as to hold that as man possesses real, not seeming, moral freedom, hence he is abstractly able to avoid sin; but that, nevertheless, in the concrete reality of life this abstract possibility is never realized. A holy life is never realized without grace. Such is the extent of Biel's much-decried Pelagianism.

But the uncatholic fatalism of Augustine was not entirely lost sight of. Occasionally an isolated mind, charmed with its seeming high appreciation of grace, raised a feeble voice in its behalf. Thus Thomas Bradwardine (*ob.* 1349) proclaimed the most absolute fatalism. In order to exalt God and abase man he held that God is the sole, direct, absolute cause of all that takes place in time. Hence there is no ground for a distinction between foreordination and foreknowledge. Predestination does not depend on foreknowledge — "quod nulla scientia Dei causatur a posterioribus rebus scitis." Even sin is, in a certain sense, willed by God. Man's will is a mere form in which God's will operates. God's will and grace are irresistible and unconditioned.

It was only by such uncatholic, unscriptural, fatalistic, and pantheistic errors that earnest though narrow men like Gottschalk and Bradwardine undertook to counteract the over-emphasizing of human ability which had practically, not theoretically, been occasionally exhibited by official orthodoxy. It is but the uniform phenomenon of human weakness. "Similia similibus curantur." One error is thought to be cured by another. But the matter is worse than that in this case. For a merely practical error is thought to be cured by committing a grave theological one. Human autonomy, moral liberty, is

thought to be kept within due limits by suppressing it altogether. Divine co-operating grace is thought to be honored by making it all-operative, and by changing it from an ethical to a magico-dynamic character.

The earnest Wiclif (*ob.* 1384) fell into this fatalistic departure from catholicity. In the footsteps of Bradwardine he held that God's causative action is the sole cause of all that *is*. And he avoided making God the direct cause of sin only by denying all positive character to sin. Sin is not an actuality, but simply a *non ens*. So far as sin exists, it is willed by God: "Deus necessitat creaturas singulas activas ad quemlibet actum suum." This manifestly annihilates all possibility of human freedom. And yet Wiclif stands aghast at this consequence, and endeavors by subtleties to avoid it. Thus his moral consciousness is synergistic and catholic, while his speculations are Augustinian and Gottschalkian.

It is by a curious though entirely unessential connection of things that the Reformation of the sixteenth century—that intense virtualization of man's moral autonomy, (*αὐτεξουσίαν*) that highest proof of the reality of man's individual initiative power—becoming outwardly associated with an unorthodox form of doctrine, theoretically annihilated that very autonomy of which it was itself the intensest exemplification. That this association of a revived Christian life in Luther, Zwinglius, and Calvin with uncatholic and unorthodox notions of an unconditional predestination and of the irresistibility of grace, was not essential but simply incidental, is evident (to cite but a single reason) from the entire absence of these notions from the great Wesleyan revival of the eighteenth century. What more thorough, spiritual, and lasting reformation than this can be cited in the whole history of the Church? And who denies its thoroughly synergistic character?

But the alliance of the Reformation with an uncatholic speculative theology is readily accounted for on historical grounds. By the time of the Reformation it had become a long-standing tradition that opposition to the official orthodoxy should assume the form of an exaggerated Augustinianism. In the first place the predestinarian innovations of Augustine himself had been officially condemned. Then, in the ninth century, when the wandering monk, Gottschalk, put himself

into antagonism to the Church of the age, it was in the name of an extreme supralapsarian predestination that he appeared. Gottschalk was rewarded for his zeal by being harassed and vexed to death. Thus his earnest, persecuted life and his high predestinarianism became historically closely associated. Four centuries later Bradwardine revived the fatalistic views of Gottschalk. He escaped persecution only by dying before official attention became fixed upon him. Wiclif took up the views of Bradwardine, and was condemned and persecuted. Huss, whose theology was but an echo of that of Wiclif, was condemned, and his followers were put down by fire and sword. Thus it had become traditional that earnest protests against the practical irreligion of the priesthood were allied with an uncatholic theology. And thus it was *a priori* almost certain that any future assaults upon the religious abuses of the official Church would be associated with an unorthodox predestinationism. And this merely incidental historical association constituted in fact the mold by which, a century later, the theoretical systems of Luther and Calvin were actually shaped.

Before noticing the peculiar doctrines of Luther and Calvin, it will be well to trace the current of Latin orthodoxy down to its latest utterances on the question before us.

Wimpina (*ob.* 1531) charged Luther with teaching direct fatalism. To this he opposed the catholic doctrine thus: If even the heathen, (Rom. i, 14,) who have but the "*lex naturae*," can by preventing grace ("*solo auxilio divino praeventi*") do works "*moraliter bona*," how much more is this the case with those who have the "*lex scripta*" and the help of special grace!—"auxilium gratuito movens!" Grace is not irresistible—"hominem non cogit ad bene operandum." It simply works with the will—"assistat et juvet arbitrium." We are synergists with God: "*Dei sumus adiutores, quod alii synergos, id est, co-operatores appellarunt.*" The "*libertas arbitrii*" is annulled neither by preventing grace ("*generalis influentia*") nor by the grace of special awakening, ("*auxilium gratuito voluntatem movens*;") but it is simply helped. The ground of predestination is the foreseen good or bad conduct of the subject. Without grace men cannot turn to God—"non possunt sese praeeparare."

The notorious Eck (*ob.* 1543) pleaded boldly for orthodoxy against the early fatalism of Melancthon: "Quia omnia de necessitate absoluta eveniunt, nulla est arbitrii libertas." Against this he had but to exclaim: "What need, then, for *preces, consilia, praeemia virtutum, poenae, leges, statuta!* Though we owe to God all that we have, yet this does not exclude the "*activitas liberi arbitrii.*" Though without grace a holy life is impossible, yet the action of grace is not of a physico-dynamic character; it does not *force*, but it *co-operates with* the will."

Erasmus (*ob.* 1536) stood firm against the revival of the errors of Augustine. He held thus: Freedom of will in man in general still exists, otherwise sin would not be sin. Our good lives are the joint products of divine grace and human freedom. Awakening grace is universal; no one is without it.

The Council of Trent (1546) in its philosophy of regeneration formulated what had been essentially the voice of orthodoxy from the beginning. It held thus: By the fall of Adam all men have so become the servants of sin that they are unable ("*non possunt*") by the law of nature to be liberated ("*liberari*") therefrom. Nevertheless, free-will is not extinct. The beginning of the regenerated life is from the prevenient grace of God. This grace becomes effective by man's freely assenting to and co-operating with it, ("*gratiae libere assentiendo et cooperando.*") Though man is able to reject grace, yet he is unable by his own free-will ("*libera sua voluntate*") to turn to holiness. "If any one saith that man's free-will, moved and excited by God, by assenting to God exciting and calling, nowise co-operates toward disposing and preparing itself for obtaining the grace of justification, and that it cannot refuse its consent if it would, but that, as something inanimate, it does nothing whatever, and is merely passive: let him be anathema." So reads Canon IV, on Justification. And Canon V is equally explicit: "If any one saith that since Adam's sin the free-will of man is lost and extinguished; or, that it is a thing with only a name; yea, a name without a reality, a figment, in fine, introduced into the Church by Satan: let him be anathema." And the unorthodox notion of the physico-dynamic action of grace is thus condemned in Canon XXIII: "If any one saith that a man once justified can sin

no more, nor lose grace, and that therefore he that falls and sins was never truly justified, . . . let him be anathema."

In these positions the Council of Trent did but re-affirm that which had been catholic doctrine from the beginning. Its voice on these points is the voice of the whole orthodox Church of the Orient. And, aside from the individualistic novelties of Augustine, it is essentially the voice of the whole series of great theologians of the West. And these definitions are final and authoritative in the whole Latin Church to this day.

Thus it appears that of the 370,000,000 of Christians in the world at the present time nearly three fourths (Schaff gives 190,000,000 of Latins, 80,000,000 of Greeks, and 100,000,000 of Protestants) teach essentially the synergism which has prevailed in the Church catholic from the beginning.

When we now turn to the Protestant Reformation of the sixteenth century we are confronted at once by the curious fact that the three great founders of Protestantism—Luther, Zwinglius, and Calvin—were decidedly uncatholic and unorthodox on the subject of the relation of divine grace to the action of the human will. They all became entangled in a physico-dynamic conception of the action of God on the souls of men. From this resulted necessarily the *irresistibility of grace*: grace being a dynamic, an efficient cause *per se*, it always produces its intended effect. This led to a *partial atonement*: Christ did not die for all, otherwise all would be saved; for grace can never be defeated. And this gives rise to the invention of two *unscriptural decrees* of election and of reprobation. But it was impossible to deny that the Bible proclaims a ready salvation for all men. How is the force of that to be evaded? By the monstrous invention of a *dualistic will in God*—a *revealed* will which offers salvation to *all* men, and a *secret* will which nullifies and defeats the revealed will!

Such was the immense ballast of uncatholic error with which Protestantism was hampered from its very infancy. Why did not the young Church sink under the burden? Simply because these errors are of such a nature that it is impossible *practically to believe them*. They imply that salvation is exclusively from God, that God saves just *whom*, and *when*, and *how* he pleases, and that all the efforts of man are incapable either of preparing, or hastening, or *in any way contributing one iota*

thereto. Now, the logical tendency of such a belief would be to paralyze all human effort and concern about our ultimate salvation. But the dogma is so contradictory to our moral consciousness that it cannot be fully believed and acted upon. Its reflex, its *indirect*, effect is to awaken in us a very strong, trembling desire that "we individually might also be among the happy number of God's elect." Now, *this desire itself* is already *essentially* a humble petition for salvation. It is a thirsting for salvation. It is really a very strong virtualization of man's moral autonomy or ethical freedom of will. It is an actual co-operating with that grace which is the congenital heritage of every child of Adam. And this right use of present ability conditions, sooner or later, a richer presence of God in the heart—the normal result of all which is a true, orthodox, catholic, synergistic conversion, such as had been taking place in the Church from the beginning.

Thus the erroneous theories of the young Protestant Church were of such a nature as to be simply hinderances, but not entire barriers, to spiritual reformation. They only retarded, but could not defeat the efforts of good and holy men. Providence uses imperfect instruments. Essentially good movements are often enwrapped in very erroneous speculations. But our healthy intuitional subjectivism will not heed our speculative abstractions, and often arrives at its goal in spite of them.

But that the predestinarian fatalism of the early Reformers was an immense misfortune to the new Church is clearly manifest from two considerations: 1. The cause of God does not need the assistance of theological and anthropological error. And surely the unvarying testimony of orthodox catholicity against an unconditional predestination justifies us in regarding such predestination as an error until it proves itself to be true. 2. The whole history of Protestant theological thought for now three and a half centuries has consisted *partly* in a vain endeavor to explain unconditional predestination into consistency with our moral intuitions, but *chiefly* in the work of eliminating and casting it off. Bright names in this great movement of Protestant emancipation and of return to orthodox catholicity are Melancthon, Arminius, Wesley. The essence of this movement has consisted in simply the self-reassertion of the healthy Christian consciousness.

The final result is, that of the 100,000,000 of Protestants now existing the very large majority have long since found their way back to the simple synergistic doctrine of œcumenical orthodoxy, while with the remnant the Augustinian errors are held more as a matter of official symbolic thralldom than from hearty youthful conviction. They lurk rather in the scholastic seminaries than in the evangelical pulpit.

We conclude, therefore, by the emphatic re-assertion of our thesis, to wit, that the synergism which was taught by Mr. Wesley is an essential of orthodox catholicity, and, by consequence, that the monergism of Augustine, Luther, and Calvin is an individualistic innovation, destined ultimately to be entirely sloughed off.

ART. II.—IGNATIUS AND HIS EPISTLES.

I. PERSONAL HISTORY.

OF the personal history of Ignatius, as of the personal history of the great majority of the Apostolical Fathers, little is known; and this little cannot be accepted with full faith in its trustworthiness. Tradition relates that he was the child whom Christ placed before his disciples as the model of humility, (Matt. xviii, 2-4; Mark ix, 36;) and as the Saviour took the child in his arms, Ignatius was consequently surnamed Theophorus, "Borne or carried by God."* The chief authority for his personal history is the *Martyrium Ignatii*, a brief narrative professing to be written by those who accompanied him on his voyage to Rome and witnessed his death. Though its genuineness has been questioned by Daillé (Dallæus) and others, it has been regarded by most scholars as the work of Philo, Agathopus, and perhaps Crocus, whom Ignatius mentions as his traveling companions.† Accepting the genuineness and authenticity of the narrative, we learn that Ignatius was bishop of the Church at Antioch at the close of the first and beginning of the

* In the "Martyrdom" (ii) this term is explained as meaning, "He who has Christ within his breast."

† Epist. to Smyr., x; to Phila., xi; to Rom., x.

second century; * that he presented himself as a Christian before Trajan's tribunal on the occasion of that emperor's expedition against Armenia and the Parthians; † that he was condemned to suffer death at Rome; that he journeyed to that city and wrote letters to the Churches on the way; and that on his arrival he was consigned to the wild beasts in the Coliseum. These are the prominent facts in the life of Ignatius. But of his personal characteristics, accepting provisionally the genuineness of his seven epistles, a more full exhibit can be made. As from the footprints on the shore Cuvier or Agassiz determined the species and size of the animal, so from the epistles of Ignatius may be learned his character by means of the impressions which he stamped upon them.

The most prominent characteristic of the author of these letters is courage. Fear is unknown to him. He is bold to apparent rashness. He is eager for a martyr's crown. "I am," he writes, "the wheat of God, and let me be ground by the teeth of the wild beasts, that I may be found the pure bread of Christ." ‡ "Entice the wild beasts," he begs his friends, "that they may become my tomb." "May I enjoy the wild beasts." "I am eager to die." Courage, bravery, fearlessness, is the conspicuous element in the character of Ignatius.

The examination of the cause of his courage reveals a second fundamental characteristic—his love of Christ. His affection for the incarnate Lord is burning and impulsive. It is as intense, to compare human things with divine, as the emotion of Abelard toward Heloise, or as self-sacrificing as the love of David for Absalom. Rejoicing in his sentence of death, he sings, "I thank thee, O Lord, that thou hast vouchsafed to honor me with a perfect love toward thee, and hast made to be bound with iron chains like thy apostle Paul." "Let," he

* Traditions differ concerning the episcopal succession. He was probably either the first or second successor of Peter.

† It is uncertain whether this expedition occurred in 106-107 or in 114-115. Coins and documents represent that Trajan did not come to Antioch on his Parthian expedition till 114 or 115. The text of the "Martyrium" upon this point is doubtful. It is either "ninth" or "nineteenth." The supposition of Tillemont, of two expeditions, is untenable.

‡ The translations are taken from the "Ante-Nicene Christian Library," edited by Rev. Alexander Roberts, D.D., and James Donaldson, LL.D. Vol. i. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 1867.

exclaims, in the divine aspiration of his soul, "let fire and the cross, let the crowds of wild beasts, . . . let all the shatterings of the whole body, let all the torments of the devil, come upon me; only let me attain Jesus Christ." Why, he asks, does he surrender himself to death, to fire, to the sword, to wild beasts? Because he who is near to the sword is near to God, and he who is among the wild beasts is in company with God, provided only he be so in the name of Jesus Christ. Ignatius is, as Novalis says of Spinoza, "God-intoxicated;" but, unlike the great pantheist, his spirit is aflame with love for the personal, living, dying, and ever-living Christ. In the strength of the incarnate God he is strong. Of his faith in the God-man is born his Pauline courage.

Flowing from his courage and Christian faith is a third element in the author's character—enthusiasm. His beliefs, his thoughts, glow with the white heat of the intensest emotions. They are not cold intellections; they flash with the furnace-fire of the feelings. The strongest metaphors quiver with the agitation which he throws into them. "It is better for me to die in behalf of Jesus Christ than to reign over all the ends of the earth," he confesses. "Suffer me to obtain pure light," he begs. "Permit me to be an imitator of the passion of my God," he commands. His enthusiasm impels to Trajan's tribunal; it hurries him across the seas to his martyrdom.

But through the warp and woof of this courage, Godward love, and enthusiasm, runs a thread of spiritual pride. In the whirl of his emotions, in the sportings of his imagination, in the extravagance of his exclamations, is discernible a hauteur neither Christ-like nor Pauline. The excesses of his wild metaphors are very unlike the calm assurance of "I have fought a good fight. I have finished my course. I have kept the faith." Their intensity breathes not only a sublime faith in the incarnate God, but also a consciousness of nobler experiences than those to which Roman or Ephesian Christian has attained. "I have," he writes, "great knowledge in God," and lest he perish through boasting a constant restraint curbs his words. His Epistle to Polycarp is colored with emotions which hardly deserve a milder term than spiritual conceit. He addresses the disciple of St. John not as an equal, but as a pupil. He implores him to give himself to prayer without ceasing. He

beseeches him to stand firm as an anvil when it is beaten. He exhorts him to be wise and to flee the arts of the devil. He commands him to be watchful and possess a sleepless spirit. A consciousness of his superiority to his brother bishop and other Christians flows through his letters. The heir of a salvation toward which he so rapidly journeys, he forgets that others are pressing toward the mark for the prize of the same high calling.

Allied with his pride in his Christian virtues is his respect for the authority and institutions of the Church. On his pages first appears the term the "Catholic Church"—*καθολικὴ ἐκκλησία*, (*Smyrnius*, chap. viii.) His pen is the first and the ablest of the early Fathers to advocate the most comprehensive unity of its organization and purity of its doctrine. To the bishop respect should be paid, he argues, as to Christ, since the one whom the master sends to be over his household should be respected as the master himself. With a similar sacredness he invests the presbyter. The presbyter is made the disciple of the bishop, as John and Peter were of Christ. In his pages not only have "the glorious company of the apostles" and "the goodly fellowship of the prophets" been endowed with divine rights, but also the holy Church throughout all the world has become the vicegerent of the King of kings.

The sixth and last element in the character of the author of the Ignatian letters which we shall examine is his tenderness toward others, or his courtesy. Occasionally this tenderness is manifested in a propensity to flatter. He tells the members of the Magnesian Church that they are "full of God," and that his Christian experience is not worthy to be compared with that of any of their number.

This courtesy of disposition is also exhibited in his treatment of those whom he deems heretics. Though pleading with earnestness for the unity of the Church, the shafts of his arguments directed against schismatics are poisoned with neither bitterness nor hate. A kindly charity breathes in his words. "Evil offshoots will produce death-bearing fruits," are the harshest terms which he discovers for the errors of the Docetæ. His severest denunciation of heretics is the plain statement that they are of this world, and shall not inherit the kingdom of God. But at the same time he urges prayer for their re-

pentance. His opponents in Christian doctrine and Church organization he treats with a civility which indicates the courtesy of his nature. This courtesy, however, is more frequently manifested in care and anxiety for the welfare of his fellow-Christians. He is a most diligent pastor. He constantly warns his flock of the wolves who would carry captive the sheep of the divine Shepherd.

II. EPISTLES.

No less than fifteen epistles are extant bearing the name of Ignatius. Two are addressed to the apostle John, and one each to the Virgin Mary, to Mary of Cassobolis, to the Tarsians, to the Antiochians, to Hero, (a deacon of the Church at Antioch,) and to the Philippians; also to the Ephesians, the Magnesians, the Trallians, the Romans, the Philadelphians, the Smyrnæans, and to Polycarp, a single letter each is inscribed. These epistles are represented by several MSS. written in several languages. (1) Two Greek MSS. contain all the letters with the exception of the two to John and the one to the Virgin. MSS. in Latin corresponding to the text of the Greek are also extant. (2) A Greek MS. ascribed to the eleventh century contains at least nine epistles: * the epistle to the Smyrnæans, to Polycarp, to the Ephesians, to the Magnesians, to the Philadelphians, to the Trallians, Mary of Cassobolis to Ignatius, Ignatius to Mary of Cassobolis, and a part of the epistle to the Tarsians.† To this MS. also corresponds a Latin version which is supposed to belong to the fourteenth century. An Armenian version, said to be as early as the fifth century, contains thirteen epistles. (3) Three MSS. in Syriac contain the epistle to Polycarp, to the Ephesians, and to the Romans. The discovery of these MSS. forms an era in the discussion of the Ignatian literature. In the years 1838, 1839, and 1842, Arch-deacon Tattam, of England, visited the monastery of St. Mary Deipara, in the desert of Nisria, in Egypt. From that monastery he obtained a large number of ancient Syriac MSS. They were deposited in the British Museum, and, on an examination by the distinguished Oriental scholar, the late Dr. William

* It is mutilated at the end, and, therefore, the exact number originally contained in it cannot be ascertained.

† See "Quarterly Review" for 1851, "Ignatian Epistles," for excellent summaries, pp. 73 *seq.*

Cureton, were found to contain the three epistles just named. The principal question discussed since the discovery of these Syriac MSS. respecting this literature is, Does the Greek or the Syriac version more exactly represent the original Ignatius? It is, of course, granted that the MSS. now existing were not themselves written by the martyr. Dr. Cureton even considers that the Syriac MS. of the epistle to Polycarp belongs to the middle of the sixth century.

Before entering upon the consideration of the genuineness of these different versions we believe we cannot be of greater aid to the reader than by placing before him the translation of the Epistle to the Romans as found in the Syriac. This epistle fairly represents the author's style and method of thought, and conveys an accurate idea of the discussion as conducted in the other letters.

EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS.

Ignatius, who is [also called] Theophorus, to the Church which has received grace through the greatness of the Father Most High; to her who presideth in the place of the region of the Romans, who is worthy of God, and worthy of life, and happiness, and praise, and remembrance, and is worthy of prosperity, and presideth in love, and is perfected in the law of Christ unblamable: [wishes] abundance of peace.

I. From of old have I prayed to God that I might be counted worthy to behold your faces which are worthy of God; now, therefore, being bound in Jesus Christ, I hope to meet you and salute you, if it be the will [of God] that I should be accounted worthy to the end. For the beginning is well arranged, if I be counted worthy to attain unto the end, that I may receive my portion without hinderance, through suffering. For I am in fear of your love, lest it should injure me. As to you, indeed, it is easy for you to do whatsoever ye wish; but as for me, it is difficult for me to be accounted worthy of God, if indeed ye spare me not.

II. For there is no other time such as this that I should be accounted worthy of God; neither will ye, if ye be silent, [ever] be found in a better work than this. If ye let me alone, I shall be the word of God; but if ye love my flesh, again am I [only] to myself a voice. Ye cannot give me any thing more precious than this, that I should be sacrificed to God while the altar is ready; that ye may be in one concord in love, and may praise God the Father through Jesus Christ our Lord, because he has deemed a bishop worthy to be God's, having called him from the East to the West. It is good that I should set from the world in God, that I may rise in him to life.

III. Ye have never envied any man. Ye have taught others.

Only pray ye for strength to be given to me from within and from without, that I may not only speak, but also may be willing, and that I may not merely be called a Christian, but also may be found to be [one]; for if I am found to be [so], I may then also be called [so]. Then [indeed] shall I be faithful, when I am no longer seen in the world. For there is nothing visible that is good. The work is not [a matter] of persuasion; but Christianity is great when the world hateth it.

IV. I write to all the Churches, and declare to all men, that I willingly die for the sake of God, if so be that ye hinder me not. I entreat of you not to be [affected] toward me with a love which is unseasonable. Leave me to become [the prey of] the wild beasts, that by their means I may be accounted worthy of God. I am the wheat of God, and by the teeth of the beasts shall I be ground, that I may be found the pure bread of God. Provoke ye greatly the wild beasts, that they may be for me a grave, and may leave nothing of my body, in order that when I have fallen asleep I may not be a burden to any one. Then shall I be a disciple of Jesus Christ, when the world seeth not even my body. Entreat of our Lord in my behalf, that through these instruments I may be found a sacrifice to God. I do not, like Peter and Paul, issue orders unto you. They are apostles, but I am one condemned; they indeed are free, but I am a slave, even until now. But if I suffer I shall be the freedman of Jesus Christ, and I shall rise in him from the dead, free. And now, being in bonds, I learn to desire nothing.

V. From Syria, and even unto Rome, I am cast among wild beasts, by sea and by land, by night and by day, being bound between ten leopards, which are the bonds of soldiers, who, even when I do good to them, all the more do evil unto me. I, however, am the rather instructed by their injurious treatment; but not on this account am I justified to myself. I rejoice in the beasts which are prepared for me, and I pray that they may in haste be found for me; and I will provoke them speedily to devour me, and not be as those which are afraid of some other men, and I will not approach them; even should they not be willing to approach me, I will go with violence against them. Know me from myself what is expedient for me. Let no one envy me of those things which are seen and which are not seen, that I should be accounted worthy of Jesus Christ. Fire, and the cross, and the beasts that are prepared, cutting off of the limbs, and scattering of the bones, and crushing of the whole body, harsh torments of the devil—let these come upon me, but only let me be accounted worthy of Jesus Christ.

VI. The pains of the birth stand over against me.

VII. And my love is crucified, and there is no fire in me for another love. I do not desire the food of corruption, neither the lusts of this world. I seek the bread of God, which is the flesh of Jesus Christ; and I seek his blood, a drink which is love incorruptible.

FOURTH SERIES, VOL. XXXII.—3

IX.* My spirit saluteth you, and the love of the Churches which received me as the name of Jesus Christ ; for those also who were near to [my] way in the flesh preceded me in every city. Now,† therefore, being about to arrive shortly in Rome, I know many things in God ; but I keep myself within measure, that I may not perish through boasting, for now it is needful for me to bear the more, and not to pay regard to those who puff me up. For they who say such things to me scourge me ; for I desire to suffer, but I do not know if I am worthy. For zeal is not visible to many, but with me it has war. I have need, therefore, of meekness, by which the prince of this world is destroyed. I am able to write to you of heavenly things, but I fear lest I should do you an injury. Know me from myself. For I am cautious lest ye should not be able to receive [such knowledge,] and should be perplexed. For even I, not because I am in bonds, and am able to know heavenly things, and the places of angels and the stations of the powers that are seen and that are not seen, am on this account a disciple ; for I am far short of the perfection which is worthy of God. Be ye perfectly strong in the patience of Jesus Christ our God.‡

Although few in number, some scholars regard the whole body of the Ignatian literature as spurious. Baur, following out the principles of the Tübingen school in relation to the earliest patristic writings, considers it a fiction of the later half of the second century. Dr. W. D. Killen, too, declares them to be forgeries.§ The principal reasons, based upon internal evidence, which Dr. Killen applies specially to the Syriac epistles, are applicable to all the letters. If the Syriac version is spurious, *a fortiori* is the Greek.

"1. The way in which the word of God is ignored in these epistles argues strongly for their spuriousness. Every one acquainted with the early Fathers must have observed their frequent use of the sacred records. A considerable portion of a chapter is sometimes introduced in a quotation. Hence it has been remarked that were all the copies of the Bible lost, and the writings of these Fathers preserved, a large share of the holy volume might thus be recovered. But Ignatius would contribute nothing to the work of restoration ; as, in the whole

* Chap. viii of the Greek is not contained in the Syriac version.

† The remainder is also found substantially in Trallians iv, v.

‡ "Ante-Nicene Christian Library," vol. i, pp. 281-285.

§ See "The Ancient Church : Its History, Doctrine, Worship, and Constitution Traced for the First Three Hundred Years," by W. D. Killen, D.D. London. 1859. Pp. 414-428.

of the three letters, not a single verse of Scripture is given at length.

"2. The chronological blunders prove their spurious character.

"3. Various words are employed in a meaning which they did not acquire till a time long after the death of Ignatius. 'Purity' or 'chastity' and 'bishop' are such terms.

"4. The puerilities, vamping, and mysticism of these letters proclaim their forgery.

"5. The unhallowed and insane desire and anxiety for martyrdom which appears throughout these letters is another decisive proof of fabrication."

But in favor of the genuineness of at least a certain part of the Ignatian literature several arguments are presented, the evidence of which, controverting the points just cited, amounts to hardly less than positive proof. It may here be remarked that the most strenuous defenders of this literature do not at the present day claim genuineness for other than the seven epistles to the Ephesians, to the Magnesians, to the Trallians, to the Romans, to the Philadelphians, to the Smyrnæans, and to Polycarp. The following arguments are limited in their application to these seven letters.

1. The testimony of the Fathers. In the epistle of Polycarp to the Church at Philippi, written probably in the first quarter of the second century, the author remarks: "The epistles of Ignatius which he wrote unto us, together with his other letters which have come to our hands, we have sent to you according to your order, subjoined to this epistle; and ye may be greatly profited by them, for they treat of faith and patience, and of all things that pertain to edification in the Lord Jesus." Eusebius, in his "Ecclesiastical History," informs us that these letters of Ignatius, alluded to by Polycarp, were quoted by Irenæus. In the third century, Origen twice cites Ignatius by name. But the most important testimony is that of Eusebius, which is remarkably full and exact:—

Ignatius, who is celebrated among many, even to the present time, had obtained the episcopate, being secured in the succession from Peter at Antioch. Of whom it is related that being sent from Syria to the city of Rome, he was devoured by wild beasts on account of his confession of Christ. And passing through Asia under the vigilant guard of his keepers, confirming the dioceses, as he stayed at each city, by verbal discourses and exhorta-

tions, he charged them most especially to beware of the heresies then springing up and beginning to abound, and exhorted them to maintain resolutely the tradition of the apostles, which for the more security he thought it necessary to set forth in writing also, thus confirming it by his own testimony. Having, therefore, arrived at Smyrna, where Polycarp was, he writes one epistle to the Church at Ephesus, mentioning its pastor, Onesimus; another to that at Magnesia on the Mæander, in which again he makes mention of their bishop, Damus; and another to that in Tralles, mentioning Polybius as then being its ruler. Besides these, he writes to the Church of the Romans; to whom he addresses an entreaty that they would not disappoint him of his hope and desire by interceding for the remission of his sentence. [Here follows the narrative found in Romans v, as quoted.] After he had set forth from Smyrna he wrote again from Troas to the Philadelphians and to the Church of the Smyrnæans, and particularly to Polycarp, its president, to whom—forasmuch as he well knew him to be an apostolical man—like a true and good shepherd he committed his flock at Antioch, entreating him diligently to take the charge of it. Moreover, in his epistle to the Smyrnæans he reports a saying, I know not whence derived, speaking in this manner concerning Christ: But I know and believe him to have been in the flesh, even after his resurrection. And when he came to Peter and the rest, he said unto them: Take hold, handle me, and see that I am not a spirit without body.

2. The vigor and freshness of their style also indicate the genuineness of these letters. These qualities are exemplified in the liberal quotations we have made, and are not such as a forger could easily counterfeit.

3. The quotations from the New Testament are very few. This proves that they were written at a time when the MSS. of the New Testament were difficult to obtain; that is, in the sub-apostolic age.

4. The directness and simplicity of its method of opposing the principal heresies of the early Church, particularly Gnosticism, show that these errors were in the first stage of development.

5. Though episcopacy is lauded,* the primacy of Rome is not recognized even in the epistle to the Romans.† This fact, though allowing no inference as to a definite date, indicates that the letters were composed not later than the third century.

The question, however, still remains for consideration, Does the Syriac or the shorter Greek recension more accurately represent the original Ignatius? That the longer Greek recension

* See Tral., vii, *et alius*.

† Schaff's "History," i, 470.

was formed by interpolations in the shorter is now granted by the common consent of scholarship. Respecting the genuineness of the Syriac or of the shorter Greek version, we incline toward the belief that the Greek more correctly represents the epistles as they were written by the martyr. The following reasons appear to us conclusive:—

1. The testimony of Eusebius, of the fourth century, proves the existence of the seven epistles which we now have in Greek. But, according to Dr. Cureton, the MS. of the Syriac version is not earlier than the sixth or seventh century, two or three centuries later than the date of Eusebius' "History," when the Greek version was circulating through the East.

2. The Greek version agrees with the citations made by the Fathers, not only of the first three centuries, but also with those of the fourth, fifth, and sixth, with an accuracy similar to that which is observed in the patristic quotations of the Scriptures.

3. The Syriac version is in places obscure for the lack of words which the Greek text supplies.

4. The translation and abridgment of Greek MSS. into Syriac was not uncommon in the first centuries of the Christian era.

5. A careful scrutiny and comparison of the Syriac and the Greek text indicates that the former is an abridgment of the latter. Baur, Hilgenfeld, and Uhlhorn, after a most minute examination of the two versions, arrived at this conclusion.*

6. The sixth and last argument that we present for the genuineness of the Greek text is derived from the personal characteristics of the author which are impressed upon the writings. These characteristics, it will be remembered, we found to be in the first division of the paper, courage, spirituality, enthusiasm, spiritual pride, extreme loyalty to the Church, and courtesy. These personal qualities, it must be observed, could not be inferred from the Syriac version.

The introduction of those personal elements into the problem of the genuineness of the Ignatian epistles materially aids its solution. The first question to be considered in relation to them is, Are these the characteristics which would be demanded in the bishop of the Church at Antioch, and which would be disciplined by the duties of that office. If they are, a strong argument follows for the genuineness of the letters; if they

* See "Quarterly Review" for 1851, pp. 97, 98; Schaff's "History," i, p. 471.

are not, a corresponding presumption is established in behalf of their forged character.

Antioch was the metropolis of Syria. It had been the residence of the Syrian kings. It was, under the early emperors, the capital city of the East. Art and architecture had made it a Syrian Athens. Wealth had been so profusely lavished in its adornment that it was known as "the golden." In its cypress groves the Daphnean pleasures were celebrated with more than oriental luxuriance and exquisiteness. This city of architectural magnificence, profuse wealth, and pagan wickedness, was for the first centuries the center of Gentile Christianity. Here the disciples were first called Christians. Here Paul labored, and from the city's gates he set forth on his first missionary journey. Its bishops, headed, tradition relates, by Peter, ranked *in ordine dignitatis* after those of Rome and Alexandria. Its Christians numbered, in Chrysostom's day, 100,000, and its Church ministered to the needs of 3,000 of its poor. Antioch was, therefore, the Syrian Jerusalem. What, then, were the qualities needed in a bishop of such a Church of such a city in the last years of the first and the first years of the second century? Courage, that persecution may be endured without disruption of membership. Spirituality, love to Christ, that doctrine may be kept pure, that the allurements of pleasure may not beguile. Pride, that the consciousness of divine duties may repel the Christian from the degradations of heathenism. A loyalty to the Church, that neither imperial edict may cause dismay nor internal jealousies create disunion. And courtesy, that the charity of which the apostles who abode in the city wrote may blossom in all its life. The qualities which are demanded in the Antiochan bishop, and which were disciplined by the episcopal office, are precisely the qualities which are impressed upon the Ignatian epistles. The agreement is obvious. Ignatius was bishop of the Church at Antioch, and the characteristics of his reputed letters are the characteristics which were needed in and disciplined by that office.

The second consideration in the solution of the problem relates to the consistency of these characteristics. Do they contradict each other? Are they natural, or, to use Dr. Whateley's word, are they plausible? If they are, the inference is strongly in favor of the genuineness of the letters from whose contents

they are deduced. The courage manifested in the Ignatian literature is of a most impulsive type. It bursts into hyperbole. It riots in extravagance of simile. It should not, however, for this reason be condemned as unreal. It is no more peculiar than the bravery of the Scottish Wishart, who, as he is bound to the stake, exclaims, "You shall not see me change my countenance. I fear not the fire." The courage of the martyr described in the letters is of that intense type befitting a follower of Stephen. Of the same strong cast, too, are his love to Christ and his enthusiasm. His spiritual pride, moreover, is the natural result of his courage, combined with a consciousness of the responsibilities with which he is clothed. His loyalty to the Church flows from his loyalty to his God, whose visible body is in peril of being torn asunder by schismatics. And his tenderness toward others is the obedience to his Master's command of loving his neighbor as himself. These characteristics are natural, plausible, consistent. They are colored with the intensest reality. The inference is, therefore, allowable that the writings whence they are drawn are neither forgeries nor the patch-work of fabricators, but that they are the genuine productions of the pen of him whose name they bear.

The conclusion, therefore, which this protracted examination necessitates favors the genuineness of the shorter Greek recension. This is the conclusion now generally adopted by the best scholars, and one that has recently been fortified by the work of Zahn. Until, therefore, more light is shed upon the question in consequence of new comparisons of the text or by the discovery of new MSS., critical opinion must incline toward the position that the Greek version more accurately represents the original Ignatius than the Syriac.

The teaching of these epistles, whose genuineness we have endeavored to prove, should be exhibited more fully than the previous drift of our discussion has permitted. Two points deserve consideration.

1. *Christology.* The representations of the letters respecting the divinity and humanity of Christ are remarkably full and positive. God was manifested by Jesus Christ his Son, who is the Word, not spoken, but essential.* Of himself he can do nothing.† He was begotten by the Father before the beginning

* *Mag.*, viii.

† *Ibid.*, vii; John v, 30.

of time; the only-begotten Son, he remains the same forever, and of his kingdom there shall be no end.* The prophets foresaw him by the Spirit, and waited for him as their teacher, and expected him as their Lord and Saviour, saying, "He will come and save us."† But he was truly man as well as truly God. He possessed all the faculties of a human being. He ate, and drank, and slept.‡ He was born of a virgin, baptized by John, and crucified by Pilate. He lived a

Holy life, and healed every kind of sickness and disease among the people, and wrought signs and wonders for the benefit of men; and to those who had fallen into the error of polytheism he made known the one and only true God, his Father, and underwent the passion, and endured the cross at the hands of the Christ-killing Jews, under Pontius Pilate the governor and Herod the king. He also died, and rose again, and ascended into the heavens to him that sent him, and is sat down at his right hand, and shall come at the end of the world, with his Father's glory, to judge the living and the dead, and to render to every one according to his works.§

2. *The Church.* The teaching of the letters regarding the Church, the bishop, and the sacraments, is exhibited in the following extract:—

See that ye all follow the bishop, even as Christ does the Father, and the presbytery as ye would the apostles. Do ye also reverence the deacons, as those that carry out [through their office] the appointment of God. Let no man do any thing connected with the Church without the bishop. Let that be deemed a proper Eucharist which is [administered] either by the bishop or by one to whom he has intrusted it. Wherever the bishop shall appear there let the multitude [of the people] also be; even as where Christ is, there does all the heavenly host stand by, waiting upon him as the chief captain of the Lord's might, and the governor of every intelligent nature. It is not lawful without the bishop either to baptize or to offer, or to present sacrifice, or to celebrate a love-feast.¶ But that which seems good to him is also well-pleasing to God, that every thing ye do may be secure and valid.¶¶

In conclusion, it only remains to present a brief review of the Ignatian controversy. Since the publication of the longer Greek recension by Pacæus in 1557 and by Gessner in 1559, and of the shorter Greek by Archbishop Usher in 1644, down

* Mag., vi; Dan. ii, 44; vii, 14, 27.

† Tral., x.

‡ Some refer this to the Lord's Supper.

† Mag., ix; Isa. xxxv, 4.

§ Mag., xi.

¶ Smyr., viii.

to the discovery of the Syriac version, criticism vacillated in its adherence to these two texts. The longer Greek was defended by Whiston (1710-11) and by C. Meier, (1836.) Daillé (Dallæus) (1666) refused to acknowledge the authenticity of either version; but the *Vindiciæ* of Bishop Pearson, (1672,) in reply to Daillé, inclined critical opinion toward the acceptance of the shorter Greek. In 1743 Lardner, ("Credibility of Gospel History,") though favoring the views of Pearson, acknowledged that, "whatever positiveness some may have shown on either side," he had "found it a very difficult question." Similar expressions of doubt were made by Justin, (1751,) Mosheim, (1765,) Griesbach, (1768,) Rosenmüller, (1795,) Neander, (1826,) and by other scholars. The discovery of the Syriac MSS. reopened the discussion. In 1846 Dr. Cureton published his *Vindiciæ Ignatianæ*, and three years later his *Corpus Ignatianum*, defending the Syriac version. His view was accepted by Lee, (1846,) Chev. Bunsen, (1847,) Ritschl, (1851, and later in 1857,) Weiss, (1852,) and by Lipsius, (1856;) and rejected by Jacobson, by Hefele in his third edition of the "Apostolic Fathers," by Dewzinger, (1849,) Petermann, (1849,) Uhlhorn, (1851 and 1856,) Rothe, (1837,) Huther, (1841,) and by Düsterdieck, (1843.) Dorner, (1845,) before the publication of the Syriac MSS., accepted the shorter Greek recension.

ART. III.—ISAIAH'S VISION OF THE CROSS.

PRE-EMINENT among all Messianic prophecies, unsurpassed in the grandeur and solemnity of its poetic diction, profound in its divine teachings beyond most other Scriptures, and full of inimitable pathos, stands the inexhaustible Fifty-third of Isaiah. It is the ancient *Ecce Homo* of an inspired man of God, an Old Testament Psalm of the Cross, setting forth in rhythmic form a prophetic picture of Vicarious Atonement. To be appreciated by the English reader it should be presented to his eye in poetic form, and our language affords no better measure than that of the heroic blank verse in which to set this matchless jewel of Hebrew poetry.

RHYTHMIC VERSION OF ISAIAH LII, 13—LIII, 12.

- 13 Behold, with wisdom shall my servant act;
 He shall rise, and be lifted and become
 Exceeding high. (14) As wonderstruck on thee
 Multitudes gazed, (so marred from man his form,
 And his appearance from the sons of men,)
- 15 So shall he sprinkle nations, multitudes.
 O'er him shut kings their mouths; for what was not
 Told them they saw, and what they had not heard
- (LIII.) They have been meditating. (1) Who believed
 What we heard? And Jehovah's arm, on whom
 Was it uncovered? (2) And he shall grow up
 Like a young shoot before him; like a root
 From the dry earth. No graceful form was his,
 Nor ornamental splendor; and we looked,
 And not a sight that we could wish for him!
- 3 Dishonored and forsaken of mankind,
 A man of sorrows, knowing sickness well,
 He was like one who hides the face from us,
 Dishonored, and we valued not his worth.
- 4 Surely, our sicknesses he lifted up;
 Our sorrows, he bore them; and we supposed
 That he was stricken with a penal curse,
 Smitten of God, and injured! (5) And he was pierced
 For our transgressions; crushed down for our sins;
 The chastisement of our peace upon him,
 And by his stripes came healing unto us!
- 6 All we like sheep have gone astray; each man
 To his own way we turned us, and Jehovah
 Mediated in him the sin of all of us.
- 7 Harassed was he, and he was sunken low
 In anguish, but he opened not his mouth.
 As a sheep to the slaughter he was led,
 And as a ewe before her shearers, dumb
 With silence, and he opened not his mouth.
- 8 From suffering and from judgment he was seized,
 And in his generation who will tell
 That he was cut off from the land of life
 Because of the transgression of my people,—
 A curse for them? (9) And he shall give the unjust
 His sepulcher, and the rich man in his death,

- Although no act of violence wrought he,
And there was no deception in his mouth.
- 10 Thus was Jehovah pleased to crush him down ;
He made him sick. If thou set forth his soul
An offering for sin, he shall see seed ;
He shall prolong his days, and in his hand
The pleasure of Jehovah shall prevail.
- 11 Of the laborious travail of his soul
Shall he see ; he shall be well satisfied.
In his superior knowledge will he bring,
The righteous one, my servant, righteousness
To multitudes, and their sins he will bear.
- 12 Therefore will I apportion him a lot
With many, and among the mighty ones
Will he divide the spoil. Because he bared
To death his soul, and was with sinners numbered.
And he the sin of many took away,
And for the sinners ever intercedes.

CRITICAL NOTES.

Chap. lii, 13. In harmony with all the ancient versions, (Chaldee excepted,) we translate *יִשְׁכִּיל*, *shall act with wisdom*. Deut. xxix, 8 ; Josh. i, 7, 8 ; Prov. xvii, 8 ; and Jer. x, 21, are cited by some scholars as instances where the word is equivalent to *הִצְלִיחַ*, *to prosper*, which is the reading of the Chaldee ; but in all these cases the primary and acknowledged meaning, *to act wisely*, suits the context as well, if not better. Nor does Hebrew parallelism require, as some critics have assumed, that the several members must closely correspond in thought. It is the wise action of Jehovah's servant that contributes as a means to his great exaltation. *And be lifted*—Not *extolled*, as the common version here renders *נִשָּׂא*. It is doubtful if *נִשָּׂא* ever has that meaning. The literal and common signification of the passive form, (Niphal,) *to be lifted*, best conveys the thought, which Jesus also utters in John xii, 32 ; and Paul in Phil. ii, 9. See a thorough and exhaustive discussion of this word, especially in its relation to the doctrine of Atonement, in the *Bibliotheca Sacra* for July, 1873 ; pp. 422-464.

Verse 14. *Wonderstruck*—The word *שֹׁכֵחַ* includes in its signification mingled surprise, horror, astonishment, and awe.

It often requires several English words to present the full force of a single Oriental term. *To gaze in wondering astonishment* is all implied in the single Hebrew word here used. *Marred*—The word מַשְׁחָה is really a noun meaning *defacement* or *deformity*; from שָׁחָה, *to destroy*. But in this construction it is best rendered as a passive participle. *Marred from man*—כִּן here has the meaning and force of *separation and distinction from*; which makes it more specific than a mere comparative, “more than any man.” His form was so marred as to be different from the ordinary appearance of a man.

Verse 15. *Sprinkle*—Such is elsewhere the only meaning of the word נָחַ. But it is usually construed with עַל, or אֵל, and with mention of that which was sprinkled. Hence several eminent scholars have suspected a corruption of the text, and proposed other readings. The Septuagint has θαυμάσονται, *wonder at*; and Le Clerc, Rosenmüller, Maurer, Hitzig and Knobel adopt in substance this meaning, though with various slight modifications. Gesenius (*Lex.*) renders, *So shall he cause many nations to rejoice in himself*. But we may safely dismiss the proposed emendations as far-fetched and needless, and the Septuagint version, with all its modifications by these later critics, as unsustained by any thing analogous in the language. The absence of the particle עַל or אֵל is no sufficient reason for giving the word נָחַ an entirely new and different meaning, and it is reasonable to assume that the prophet purposely avoided a direct and particular specification of the substance to be sprinkled. He uses an incomplete but pregnant expression, and leaves his readers to gather his meaning from the ordinary hallowed associations of the word. See an able exposition of this passage by Professor Tayler Lewis, *Bibliotheca Sacra* for January, 1873. *O'er him kings shut their mouths*—עָלָיו, *over him*; that is, *on account of him*; or, more precisely, as they look *upon him* and ponder *over him*. Nägelsbach well observes, “On account of his surprisingly imposing appearance, they are dumb.” Gesenius, after the Septuagint, construes עָלָיו with what precedes, but contrary to the Masoretic pointing and the better meaning of the passage.

Chap. liii, 1. *What we heard*—Heb., שָׁמַעְנוּ. Eng. ver., *our*

report. Allusion to לֹא־שָׁמְעוּ, *what they had not heard*, in the preceding verse.

Verse 2. *Graceful form*—הָאֵר, says Nägelsbach, is like the Latin *forma*, with the special meaning of *beautiful form*. Comp. Jer. xi, 16; 1 Sam. xvi, 18. The word הָרַר is another one of those pregnant Hebrew expressions which mean more than any one English word fully conveys. It implies *glory, honor, beauty, and magnificence*, all blended into one splendid ideal, which the common version, *comeliness*, does not fully express. We render by the words *ornamental splendor*.

Verse 3. נִבְזָה, *dishonored*, in the sense of being treated with contempt; despised. *Forsaken of mankind*—Hengstenberg and Nägelsbach take חָרַל in an active intransitive sense, as *ceasing from among men, or ceasing to be regarded as a man*. The Septuagint reads: *his form was despised* and ἐκλείπον παρὰ πάντας ἀνθρώπους, *defective above all men*. Symmachus: ἐλάχιστος ἀνδρῶν, *least of men*. Vulgate: *novissimum virorum, newest or last of men*; or, as Hengstenberg explains, “most abject of men.” This variety shows what uncertainty as to the exact meaning prevails among interpreters. The passive sense, *forsaken of men*, which we have adopted as the simplest and most obvious, is sanctioned by many of the best critics, as Gesenius, Ewald, Hitzig and Alexander, and finds support in Job xix, 14. *Knowing sickness*—Thus the Septuagint, Syriac and Vulgate versions give יָרַע, which is the passive participle, an active signification. Hence some suppose the true reading to have been originally יָדַע, *knowing*, and such is indeed the reading in eight MSS. But the passive participle is allowed by the best critics to signify *acquainted with*, and this sense our version gives, though expressed in the active form. The Septuagint has: *knowing how to bear* μαλακίαν, *weakness*. Symmachus: γνωστός νόσῳ, *known by disease*. Vulgate: *scientem infirmitatem, knowing infirmity*. There is no need of departing from the usual meaning of the word חָלַי, *sickness; disease*. It occurs again in the plural in the next verse, and its root in verse 10. The Messiah was acquainted with sickness in all its forms. See the exposition below. *Like one who hides the face from us*—That is, like a leper, (Lev. xiii, 45,) or a mourn-

er, (2 Sam. xv, 30.) כָּתַר may be taken as the shortened form of the Hiphil participle of כָּתַר, *to hide*. Four MSS. read כִּתְּרִי. Some take כָּתַר as a noun, and render as the margin of the Eng. version: *as a hiding of faces*. Hence arose the explanation that others hid their faces from him. כָּפַנּוּ may mean either *from us*, or *from him*. The English version adopts the latter sense, and renders the whole passage: "We hid as it were our faces from him." Hahn, however, understands that Jehovah's face was hidden from him. But in the absence of any new subject expressed, it seems far simpler and more natural to construe כָּתַר with the main subject of the entire verse. We thus preserve a natural order and harmony of thought and sentiment, and have a striking portraiture of the despised and rejected Messiah.

Verse 4. *He bore them*—סָבַלָם. Nearly all versions and interpreters neglect the pronominal suffix סָ— in this word, which gives a noticeable emphasis to the thought: Not only did he lift our sicknesses, but our sorrows, he bore *them too*. The expression, *stricken with a penal curse*, is all involved and implied in the single word נִגַּע. The noun נִגַּע is the common term used for the plague of leprosy, considered as a judgment stroke.

Verse 5. *Crushed down*—כָּדָבָא. Compare also this word in verse 10. It implies more than *bruised* of the English and most versions. It involves also the idea of being trampled down and broken to pieces. Compare chap. xix, 10; Job iv, 19; Psa. lxxii, 4; Lam. iii, 34. *Came healing*—Henderson regards רָפָא as a noun, but it is better to take it as the Niphal form of רָפָא, used impersonally: *it was healed*, or, *there came healing*.

Verse 6. *Mediated in him*—חֲפָצֵה בּוֹ, *caused to meet in him*. Thus the profound thought of atoning satisfaction, or vicarious mediation, seems most fittingly expressed. The English version, *laid on him*, is too weak; the Septuagint, *The Lord delivered him for our sins*, is too general and vague, entirely missing the exact and peculiar expression of the Hebrew. The Vulgate, *The Lord placed in him the iniquity of us all*, is better, but still is defective. Symmachus is most

exact: κύριος καταντήσαι ἐποίησεν εἰς αὐτὸν τὴν ἀνομίαν πάντων ἡμῶν, *The Lord made to come into him the iniquity of all of us.* The Hiphil of נָפַח means to *cause any thing to meet or strike with violence*; and it was in the soul of Jesus that the violent vicarious stroke was felt, and met, and sustained. Let it be observed, also, how prominent is the thought of *mediation* and *intercession* conveyed by this word wherever it is used in the Hiphil form. See verse 12, and chap. lix, 16; Jer. xv, 11; xxxvi, 25; Job xxxvi, 32.

Verse 7. לַחֵם is not properly a *lamb*, (as rendered in Septuagint, Vulgate, English versions, etc.,) for lambs are not wont to be shorn; but a *ewe*, a grown female sheep.

Verse 8. Many and various have been the expositions of the different parts of this verse. The Septuagint is quoted in Acts viii, 33, and is there properly rendered in the English version: "In his humiliation his judgment was taken away; and who shall declare his generation? for his life is taken from the earth." But of this translation there are several different interpretations, and its citation by the Evangelist is no evidence that the Septuagint gives the true sense of the Hebrew. Clearly the Septuagint is not an accurate translation of our present Hebrew text. The English version is, *He was taken from prison and from judgment*; margin, *He was taken away by distress and judgment*; Lowth translates, *By an oppressive judgment he was taken off*; Noyes, *By oppression and punishment he was taken away*; Barnes, *From confinement and a judicial sentence he was taken*, [to death.] Several of these interpretations are possible, and it seems bootless to argue *in extenso* in favor of one or against another. The calm and impartial judgment, after repeated examination and comparison of views, will incline to that which appears most faithful to the Hebrew text, and yields the clearest and most natural sense. But it is very possible that the critical taste will decide differently for different minds, and out of several allowable interpretations one will adopt one version, another a different one, according to subjective feelings and habits of thought. With the Vulgate, (*de angustia et de judicio sublatus est*,) most of the older expositors, and many moderns, we understand the first line of the taking of the Messiah from his suffering and judgment up to the throne of God, as the man-

child of Rev. xii, 5. The *דָּבַר*, *judgment*, we understand of the mock judicial process through which Jesus was put, and all the suffering it involved. *His generation* (*דּוֹר*) is not his unending life, (Luther, Calvin,) nor his manner of life, (Le Clerc, Lowth,) nor his posterity, (Hengstenberg, Barnes, Nägelsbach,) but his contemporaneous generation, the primary and usual meaning of the word. So Gesenius, Ewald, Rosenmüller, and Alexander. The last named renders the whole verse thus: "From distress and from judgment he was taken; and in his generation who will think that he was cut off from the land of the living for the transgression of my people, (as) a curse for them?" The words *לְנֶפֶשׁוֹ* mean literally *a stroke for them*. Compare the word *נָפַח* in verse 4, and our note there. We translate and construe the words here as epexegetical of the two lines immediately preceding. To take *לְנֶפֶשׁוֹ* as a singular is scarcely allowable, and the version, *a stroke was to him*, or *he was stricken*, (as English version,) is inexact. Nor does the plural, as we translate it, favor the views of those critics who urge that the suffering servant of Jehovah is not an individual, but the collective body, or people. On the contrary, for them, the many, he is made a curse. Gal. iii, 13.

Verse 9. The subject of the verb *נָתַן* is not easy to determine. Some understand *נָתַן*, *my people*, from the preceding verse, and others make the verb indefinite and impersonal, *they gave*, or *there shall be given*. But as Jehovah is so uniformly represented through all this chapter as overruling and directing the sufferings and humiliation of his servant, it seems better here to understand Jehovah as the subject of the verb. The sense, then, is, that God gave or assigned him his grave with the wicked, and yet arranged that in his death (that is, while dead) his body should rest in the grave of a rich man. This he permitted, although there was no crime or falsehood in the sufferer. In accordance with this view, Jehovah is said, at the beginning of the next verse, to be pleased to crush him down and afflict him. We therefore render the *וְ*, *and*, at the beginning of verse 10, by *thus*, as best setting forth in English the continuity of thought.

Verse 10. *If thou set forth his soul*—*כִּי* is generally taken here as a particle of time, as in the English version, *when thou*

shalt make, etc. But its common and almost uniform meaning, *if*, suits the context as well, and better preserves the emotional element in the language. Most interpreters make נַפְשׁוֹ the subject of הָשֵׁם, *if his soul shall make an offering*; but such a mode of expression is unusual and awkward. Usage requires that שֵׁם be followed by an object expressed. The sudden change of person is no more difficult to explain here than in chap. lii, 14, 15. After having said, in verse 6, that Jehovah mediated in him our sin, and having commenced this verse with the statement that Jehovah was pleased to crush him down and make him sick, he appropriately turns in direct address to Jehovah, and says with prophetic confidence, *If THOU set forth his soul*, etc.

Verse 11. *In his superior knowledge*—This rendering brings out the deep thought of בִּרְקֵהוּ better than the weaker expression of the common version, *by his knowledge*. It is in the profound depth and power of divine wisdom that the Messiah finds wherewith to bring in righteousness to fallen, sinful man. So רַעַה is a counterpart of יֹשֶׁבֶל in chap. lii, 13. The words *the righteous one, my servant*, are emphatic, and need to be placed in the order we have put them to exhibit the peculiarity and force of the Hebrew idiom. The verb יִרְדֵּק is the future Hiphil of צָדַק, and, followed by ל, properly means *will bring righteousness to*. There is a play on the Hebrew words which we have sought to retain in our translation.

Verse 12. *Among the mighty ones*—This seems to be the real meaning of the passage, and is the rather required by the use of בַּרְבִּים in ב in the first member of the parallelism. But the accusative sign in אֶת־יְצִיזִים gives some warrant for Lowth's version :

Therefore will I distribute to him the many for his portion,
And the mighty people shall he share for his spoil.

The literal meaning of הִעֲרָה, Hiphil of עָרָה, *to make bare, or naked*, is better than the less frequent and doubtful meaning *poured out*, of the English version. We translate the future Hiphil form יִפְנֶיֶת by *ever intercedes*. The past tense of the same verb in verse 6 we translate *mediated*. There the past tense points rather to the sacrifice "*once* offered to bear the

sins of many." Heb. vii, 27; ix, 12, 26, 28; x, 12. Here the future points rather to the everlasting intercession. Heb. vii, 25, 28.

EXPOSITION.

These fifteen verses form a clearly defined section by themselves, but they must not be severed from their context, or treated as if they had not a vital connection with what precedes and what follows after. Alexander justly condemns "the radical error of supposing that the book is susceptible of distribution into detached and independent parts." It has its divisions more or less clearly defined, but they cling to each other, and are interwoven with each other, and form a living whole. It is beautifully observed by Nägelsbach that "chapters xlix-lvii are like a wreath of glorious flowers intertwined with black ribbon; or like a song of triumph, through whose muffled tone there courses the melody of a dirge, yet so that gradually the mournful chords merge into the melody of the song of triumph. And at the same time the discourse of the prophet is arranged with so much art that the mourning ribbon ties into a great bow exactly in the middle. For chapter liii forms the middle of the entire prophetic cycle of chapters xl-lxvi."

The immediate connection with what precedes may be thus seen: In lii, 1-12, the future salvation of Israel is glowingly depicted as a restoration more glorious than that from the bondage of Egypt or from Assyrian exile. Jerusalem awakes and rises from the dust of ruin; the captive is released from fetters; the feet of fleet messengers speed with good tidings, and the watchmen take up the glad report, and sound the cry of redemption. And then (verse 11) an exhortation is sounded to depart from all pollution and bondage, and the sublime exodus is contrasted (verse 12) with the hasty flight from Egypt, but with the assurance that, as of old, Jehovah would still be as the pillar of cloud and fire before them and behind them. At this our passage begins, and the thought naturally turns to the great Leader of this spiritual exodus—a greater than Moses, even though that ancient servant of Jehovah was faithful in all his house. Num. xii, 7. Our prophet proceeds to delineate Him whose sufferings and sorrows for the transgressions of his people far transcended those of Moses, and whose final triumph

through the fruit of the travail of his soul shall be also infinitely greater.

Verse 13. In profound spiritual emotion, and in order to intensify in others the vivid conception he himself has of Messiah, the prophet writes, *Behold!* He himself sees, and he expects his readers to see, the wondrous personage who fills the vision of his soul. But his spirit is so seized and borne along (*φερόμενος*, 2 Pet. i, 21) by the Spirit of Jehovah that he speaks in the Divine Name, and says, *Behold MY servant!* (Compare chap. xlii, 1.) Though his goings forth have been from everlasting, (Mic. v, 2,) and he dwelt in the glory of the Father before the world was, (John xvii, 5;) though in the form of God, and holding an equality with God; he emptied himself of this glory, and took the form of a *servant*. Phil. ii, 6, 7. Thus he became the *sent* of God, (John v, 36, 37; Rom. viii, 3; 1 John iv, 9, 10;) the *apostle* of our profession. Heb. iii, 1. And like a faithful servant he says: "Lo, I come; in the volume of the book it is written of me, I delight to do thy will, O my God." Psalm xl, 7, 8; compare Heb. x, 5-10. "My meat is to do the will of him that sent me, and to finish his work." John iv, 34. But the first thing to which our attention is called is the consummate wisdom with which this servant acts. The great wisdom of God's ancient servant Moses was honored and utilized in training Israel, in saving them from numerous enemies and calamities, and in giving them a code of laws the most ennobling ever given to man. And when Moses handed over his work to Joshua and the elders he repeatedly admonished them to *act wisely*. Deut. xxix, 9; Josh. i, 7, 8. But in this greater prophet are "hidden all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge." Col. ii, 3. He is the embodiment and representative of the wisdom of God, (1 Cor. i, 24;) and by this wisdom he rose through suffering and blood until he became *exceeding high*. Near the close of this section (liii, 11) we are again reminded that it is by his *superior knowledge* that he atones for sin, and brings righteousness to the guilty. So in the suffering Christ the redeemed will ever behold "the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God." Rom. xi, 33. Observe also the climax in the three verbs here used. First, *he shall rise*, appear among men and become eminent and famous; then he shall be *lifted up* even "as Moses lifted up the serpent in

the wilderness." John iii, 14; viii, 28; xii, 32. The cross was a necessary part of this exaltation, "for it became Him, for whom are all things and by whom are all things, in bringing many sons unto glory, to make the Captain of their salvation perfect through suffering." Heb. ii, 10. But this lifting on the cross leads to a higher elevation. "We see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels for the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honor." Heb. ii, 9. For God has highly exalted him, (Phil. ii, 9,) and set him at his own right hand, (Acts ii, 33,) and given him a name which is above every name. Wherefore he has *become exceeding high*.

Verses 14, 15. From the thought of his lofty elevation we are turned to his deep humiliation, and the one is compared and contrasted with the other. Verse 14 is the *protasis*, and the first part of verse 15 is the *apodosis* of one connected sentence. The words in parentheses give the reason why multitudes gazed on him in wonderstruck amazement. The comparison begins with a direct address to the sufferer, *on thee*, for the spectacle was intensely vivid in the prophet's eye; but as the words in parentheses go on in a double parallelism to explain the use of the strong expression, *gazed wonderstruck*, and naturally fall in the third person, verse 15 proceeds in the use of the same person, as by attraction. Then, too, the sufferer was vividly prominent, but the sprinkling of many nations was comparatively distant and far future. The shocking disfigurement of Jehovah's servant is to be understood of the effect on the appearance of Christ of the agony in the garden, the indignity and scourging of the mock trial, the fainting and sinking beneath the weight of the cross, and the tortures of crucifixion. But, having once risen from his humiliation, *he shall sprinkle many nations*. And with the word *sprinkle* we are to associate all the ideas of *purification*, *sanctification*, and *consecration* which the word holds in connection with the symbolic ceremonials of Israel. The prophet does not linger to particularize or define the process or methods of the sprinkling. Whether he shall sprinkle with blood, or water, or oil, with or without hyssop branch, he does not say. The variety and completeness of his purification and consecration we may elsewhere learn. In the *protasis*, *multitudes* may refer to individuals, but in the *apodosis* it qualifies *nations*. Multitudes of

people (individuals) gazed wonderstruck on the suffering Christ, but they were mostly of one nation, the Jews; but the exalted Christ shall sprinkle *many nations*. So exalted and honored shall he become, that even kings, as they look upon and diligently consider him, shall show their self-humiliation and awe by the well-known sign of covering their mouths with their hands. Comp. Job xxix, 9; xl, 4; Micah vii, 16. These kings are the rulers of Gentile nations, who had not, like the chosen people, been *told* of Christ, nor *had heard* of him till he was preached to them as the divine Prince and Saviour. Compare the apostle's use of this text as denoting the preaching of the Gospel to the Gentiles. Rom. xv, 21. Many of the kings and potentates of the nations since the days of Constantine have seen the salvation of Christ, and meditated diligently on his power and work. And this shall be more and more the case as the nations become evangelized; for the Lord Christ will be seen to be mightier than the kings of the earth.

Chap. liii, 1. We have seen above (verse 13) how the inspired prophet speaks in Jehovah's name, as in some sense identified with him. But he is myriad-souled, and now, identifying himself with his own people, Israel, he speaks in their name, and asks abruptly: *Who believed what we heard?* Who of us Israelites comprehended the Messianic prophecies so as to accept and acknowledge their fulfillment? The heathen saw and duly considered the Christ, of whom they had not previously heard; but how unbelieving was favored Israel! The prophet proceeds in the next sentence to put the question in a still stronger form, which we may thus paraphrase: Who that saw Messiah's humble birth, and rise, and reproach, and suffering, and death, discerned in it all a revelation of Jehovah's saving power? The *arm* is representative or symbolic of strength, power; and the Gospel, including all the revelations and means of grace, is the power of God unto salvation to the believer. Rom. i, 16. *On whom* (not *to whom*) is emphatic, and denotes that Jehovah's power is revealed from on high, and in its working comes down *upon* the soul.

Verses 2, 3. Still speaking in the name of Israel, the prophet proceeds to give reasons why they would not believe. The outward appearance of this Servant of Jehovah would not conform to their ideas of Messianic grace and glory. He would

grow up before Jehovah like a tender shoot, or sucker, of a plant or tree; or, to put the image more strikingly, like a root buried in the dry and barren earth, sending forth its sprout where there was little or no probability of its ever showing signs of life again; and, even if it did sprout, no probability of its ever attaining any considerable growth. Comp. Isa. xi, 10. Also, his personal appearance lacked the gracefulness and pompous grandeur which Israel expected to see in the coming Messiah. They looked, and, instead of a graceful and athletic David, adorned with all the magnificence of Solomon, behold, a sight far, very far, from their notion and desire! To this suggestive negative it is added, positively, (verse 3,) that this Servant of God was even *dishonored and forsaken of men*; so identified was he with what are regarded as the sorrows and woes and maladies of mankind that he is explicitly called *a man of sorrows*, and thoroughly familiar with *sickness*. Comp. next verse. Nay, more; his appearance suggests the conduct of a despised leper, or lonely and abandoned mourner, who covers his face and withdraws, as if desiring to hide away from those who show him no sympathy and treat him with dishonor. For his people, the prophet confesses, *we valued not his worth*; we did not properly esteem him, but misunderstood the nature of his sufferings.

Verses 4-6. The last statement, namely, that Israel did not properly estimate the Man of sorrows, leads the prophet at once to set forth the vicarious nature of his sufferings. And, first, he reverts to the idea of *sickness* just named, and, enlarging it into the conception of its manifold forms of misery, he uses the plural, and with the particle of strong affirmation says: *Surely our sicknesses he lifted*. We must guard against confounding *sicknesses* with *sorrows*, mentioned in the next line. This is a defect of our common English version, which here has the word *griefs*. But the two words should be taken together, as designed to denote both bodily and spiritual pains. It is no objection that Jesus was never sick in the ordinary sense. We have just been told that he *knew sickness*, (verse 3;) he was acquainted with disease in all its forms and power, and so knew how to lift it off of miserable men. To do this he must needs know something about sickness, and we are assured that he was "touched with the feeling of our infirmities."

Heb. iv, 15. In Matt. viii, 17, our prophet's words are quoted and said to be fulfilled in Jesus' casting out demons and healing all that were sick; and there we have the peculiar reading: "Himself took our infirmities and bore our sicknesses." Let us beware how we dilute these words. In working his miracles of mercy there went out a conscious power from the Lord. Mark v, 30. When he stood face to face with the miseries of mortality, he sighed, (Mark vii, 34,) and at the grave of Lazarus his spirit surged with mingled grief and ire, (ἐμβρομάουαι.) John xi, 33, 38. His soul was intensely sensitive, and capable of sorrow, even unto death. Matt. xxvi, 38. He entered into the keenest emotion under a sense of other's woes, and he saw in all the forms of sickness so many various ebullitions of sin working wrath and death in human nature. And so healing of the sick was a part of his redeeming and mediating work. In all his miracles of mercy to the sick and the maimed and the blind he literally *lifted* their diseases, lifted them up and bore them away. At times, at least, it made him sick to do it, (verse 10;) and the culmination of all his anguish was in Gethsemane and on the cross. We are to think of him as consciously entering into and grasping a thousand forms of human woe in order to lift and bear away the fearful load. But while the suffering Christ bore all this load, Israel strangely misunderstood him. They looked upon him as they would look upon a leper, and supposed that he suffered under some fearful judgment-stroke of the Almighty. And there was a partial truth in this opinion. He was smitten of God, as verse 5 goes on to show, but not in the sense that Israel imagined. Not for his own sins was he smitten, but *he was pierced for our transgressions, crushed down for our sins*. Here the prophet utters his profoundest oracle, and we are furnished with the most explicit statement of the Messiah's vicarious suffering. The vivid picture may have been helped by the prophet's knowledge of David's crucial psalm. Psa. xxii; comp., especially, verse 16. It would almost seem that he descried afar the crushing violence of the assembly of the wicked that hurried the Christ away to the spot where they pierced his hands and feet and side. But the piercing and the crushing have also a profounder meaning. They are to be understood of all the bitter and unspeakable agonies of the

passion hour. So, too, the words that follow. His sufferings are presented as the scourgings of a *chastisement* by which *our peace* with God is secured. Such chastisement was visited *upon him*; inflicted with many *stripes*, (comp. Matt. xxvii, 26; John xix, 1; Luke xxiii, 16,) and so he has become our peace. Eph. ii, 14-17. O blessed stripes, by which there comes divine healing to the sin-sick soul!

The sinner's waywardness and folly are well compared to the perverse wanderings of a silly sheep, (verse 6,) and here the prophet seems to look beyond any one race, or people, and utters words of universal application: ALL WE *like sheep*. All have sinned and come short of the glory of God, and there is imperative need that redemption be provided for all, without exception. And now comes that pregnant and profound expression, *Jehovah mediated in him the sin of all of us*. See on this the critical notes above. In him, in the living, spotless soul of Jesus, Jehovah caused to meet and strike with fearful violence the sin and guiltiness of a wicked world. What language can picture, what thinking spirit comprehend, the awful throes of that mediation! He who knew no sin by any personal transgression in thought, word, or deed, and who never made the slightest deflection from perfect righteousness, took upon himself our nature, and felt the violence of all our woes. As Elisha "stretched himself upon the child, and put his mouth upon his mouth, and his eyes upon his eyes, and his hands upon his hands," (2 Kings iv, 34,) so the Incarnate Word put himself in closest possible contact with all that is human; but, unlike Elisha, who felt not the agony of the child's death, the Lord Jesus seized (*ἐπιλαμβάνω*, Heb. ii, 16) guilty humanity with such a grasp that all its sinfulness and sorrow, like a baleful electric shock, sent nameless pangs of horror and amazement (Mark xiv, 33) through his soul, and prompted on the cross the bitter cry, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me!"

Verse 7 informs us how Jehovah's servant demeaned himself under his sore oppression and trial. Twice over we are told with emphasis, *he opened not his mouth*. He made no struggle to resist his oppressors, though conscious of a power to call in the aid of twelve legions of angels. Matt. xxvi, 53. His inoffensive silence is touchingly set forth by the double

simile of the sheep and the ewe. One has but to read the mockery and contemptuous treatment Jesus quietly received at the hands of the Jews, Herod, Pilate, and the soldiers, until he sank down under the weight of his cross, to have a most lively illustration of the several statements of this verse. Compare, especially, Matt. xxvii, 29-44; Luke xxiii, 11; Heb. xii, 3; 1 Pet. ii, 23.

Verse 8. Having now given the vivid picture of Messiah's sufferings and his meekness under them all, the prophet passes to speak of "the glory that shall follow." 1 Pet. i, 11. But with all his triumph and glory there is constantly associated the memory of his sore travail and sacrificial death. That thought finds expression in every succeeding verse. First, the seer seems to see him snatched away from the *suffering and judgment* which he had portrayed. He is lifted up-on the cross, and thence to paradise, and afterward to the throne of God, by his resurrection and ascension. But what most affects the seer is the thought that the generation which should see the Messiah cut off (compare Dan. ix, 26) would not understand, nor be able to tell that he was cut off from the land of the living, not for himself, but for the transgression of Israel. As Balaam's vision penetrated the far future, and caused him in view of wonders to come to exclaim, "Alas, who shall live when God doeth this!" (Num. xxiv, 23,) so our prophet, but with deeper pathos, cries out, partly by question, partly by exclamation, "Who in Messiah's day will tell that he was cut off and made a curse for Israel's sin!" The phrase, *a curse for them*, is another pregnant expression peculiar to Isaiah, and sums up in itself all that has been said before of the vicarious nature of Messiah's sufferings. *The land of life*, or land of the living, is the earth, where dwell all in whom is "the breath of life." Gen. ii, 7. It is thus distinguished from Sheol, or Hades, the dwelling of the dead.

Verse 9. But while the personal and conscious spirit of Messiah is taken away from suffering and from judgment, God still permits his lifeless body to be left, in the eyes of the world, exposed to all the indignities to which crucified criminals were liable. Such were usually cast aside without the rites of decent burial, and left to be devoured by dogs and unclean birds. The Providence, however, that suffered not a

bone of Jesus to be broken, caused his body to be given to a rich man, and deposited, during the period of his death, in a sepulcher hewn in the rock. Matt. xxvii, 57-60. Nevertheless, the death of Jesus and the disposal of his body would ever be associated with a malefactor's end. He was numbered with transgressors, (verse 12,) and the unjust Pilate and his soldiers had the control and disposition of his burial, and only by the Roman governor's consent could Joseph of Arimathea take the body away. All this was a part of the humiliation and indignity heaped upon one who was guilty of no violence or wrong. Compare 1 Pet. ii, 22. The rich man's obtaining the body from Pilate is not to be pressed as a triumph, and set forth as a deliverance of Jesus from the unjust; but only as a noticeable incident in connection with his death.

Verse 10. And now comes the wonderful announcement that *Jehovah was pleased to crush him down* like this. It was no accident; nor were Messiah's sorrows, and painful knowledge of the sicknesses of humanity, and the taking of them on himself, (verses 3, 4,) a penalty or consequence of his own sin, but *God made him sick*. He subjected him to all the humiliation that has been portrayed above, and such was his pleasure. For "thus it behooved Christ to suffer." Luke xxiv, 26, 46; Acts xvii, 3. There was a divine necessity that called for the sacrifice, and the sufferer was not an unwilling victim, but freely "bared his soul to death." Verse 12. And God set him forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, (Rom. iii, 25,) to manifest his glory, and wisdom, and power, and to bring many sons unto glory. Heb. ii, 10. In every stage and aspect of this atoning work the Eternal Father might well smile, and say, as when Jesus submitted himself to be identified with sinners in the baptism of repentance, "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased."

Rising now in his emotion, the prophet addresses Jehovah, and, with an inspiration and revelation like that which once lifted Simon Peter beyond himself, (Matt. xvi, 17,) he says, *If thou set forth his soul* (that is, Messiah's soul) *an offering for sin, he* (Messiah) *shall see seed*, (that is, posterity.) If the All-wise Jehovah make his servant's soul a trespass-offering, (עֲוֹן,) what immeasurable results are likely to follow! Such expiatory sacrifice will doubtless insure the noblest gains, else would not

the Omniscient make it. To see a numerous and powerful posterity was among the highest hopes of the pious Israelite, (compare Gen. xvii, 5, 6; 1, 23; Job xlii, 16; Psalm cxxvii, 3-5; cxxviii, 6;) and the thought is here used as peculiarly fitted to impress upon the Israelitish mind an ideal of Messiah's after glory. In his spiritual seed would be fulfilled in its grandest form the ancient promise to Abraham, (Gen. xii, 3; xv, 5;) for the justified by faith are the true sons of Abraham, and also sons of him whose day of glory Abraham rejoiced to see. John viii, 39, 56; Rom. ii, 28, 29. In the next sentence we meet a kindred thought, *he shall prolong his days*. In a higher and grander sense than worldlings think, the Messiah has "the power of an endless life." Heb. vii, 16. Length of days in the temporal sense (Exod. xx, 12; Deut. iv, 40; Prov. iii, 2) was not for him who was cut off for Israel's transgression, (verse 8;) but by his voluntary sacrifice of himself, and obedience even unto the death of the cross, he obtained the keys of death and Hades, and is alive for evermore. Rev. i, 18. And so he attains "an unchangeable priesthood," (Heb. vii, 24, 25; compare Psalm xxi, 4;) and abides "the same yesterday, and to-day, and forever." Heb. xiii, 8. And also, having risen to the right hand of God, (Psalm cx, 1,) "he must reign till he hath put all enemies under his feet." 1 Cor. xv, 25. In view of all this it is absolutely certain that *the pleasure of Jehovah*, his desire and purpose in the whole plan of redemption, *in his hand* (his servant's hand) shall prosper and prevail. Jehovah was pleased to crush his servant down, (verse 10,) not because he delighted in his or any one's sufferings, but because it was only by his stripes that the leprosy of sin could be healed, (verse 5,) and those results reached in which Jehovah has everlasting delight.

Verse 11. And yet in another form will the rapt prophet set forth the glorious outcome of Messiah's toil. *Of the laborious travail of his soul shall he see*; that excruciating labor, previously described, shall yield rich harvests to his eye, such as will abundantly *satisfy* him. He will see that the "much fruit" resulting from the dying grain is ample recompense for all the sacrifice. John xii, 24, 32. And with this thought he returns to that of the divine wisdom with which he began his lofty strain, (lii, 13;) and as the vision glows before him, and he is

conscious that Jehovah's own word is on his tongue, he again speaks in his name, and calls the wonderful Messiah *my servant*, and says of him: *in his superior knowledge will he bring righteousness to multitudes*. In his wisdom and knowledge are the infinite resources by which Messiah becomes "the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth." Rom. x, 4. He suffers for sins, the just for the unjust, that he may bring us sinners to God. 1 Pet. iii, 18. Thus he maintains and honors divine justice, while at the same time he secures justification to every sinner that believes in Jesus. Rom. iii, 26. Thus is manifested "the righteousness of God by faith of Jesus Christ unto all and upon all them that believe." Rom. iii, 22. In his exalted state his mediation ever continues, (verse 12,) and as truly as he bore our sorrows, (verse 4,) he will ever *bear* the sins of many.

Verse 12. And now comes the grand conclusion. *Therefore*, says Jehovah through his prophet, in view of all the humiliation and suffering of my servant, and the results that follow, *I will apportion him a lot with many*. I will see that he obtain a reward worthy of a princely conqueror. In leading many sons unto glory he shall share with them an incorruptible inheritance, and the *many*, having become the sons of God, are also heirs, "heirs of God, and joint heirs with Christ." Rom. viii, 17. It takes nothing away from the glory of the Messiah that others share it with him. Rather, his glory attains perfection only when his own redeemed rise to be with him in his glory and behold its splendor. John xvii, 24. Nor will the glorified sons of God be unsuitable partners in Messiah's triumph. He himself will recognize them as fellow conquerors, and say: "To him that overcometh will I give to sit with me in my throne, even as I also overcame, and am set down on my Father's throne." Rev. iii, 21. Among such will Messiah delight to *divide the spoil*, as a conqueror among many *mighty ones*, and they shall all be "kings and priests unto God." Rev. 1, 6; v, 10; xx, 6; xxii, 5. In that day will the great Spoil-divider say: "Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world." Matt. xxv, 34. Thus the vision stretches far beyond the millennial age, even into the new heavens and new earth, in which the saints will reign forever with their immortal Lord.

But the burden of this prophecy is the suffering and sacrifice that yield surpassing glory ; and the inspired prophet will not close without once more reminding us that all this glory is possible *because he bared his soul to death*. "For the joy that was set before him he endured the cross, despising the shame." Heb. xii, 2. The words, *with sinners he was numbered*, are cited by Mark (xv, 28) and Luke, (xxii, 37,) as fulfilled in the fact that Jesus was crucified like a transgressor, and between two criminals. The last two lines express the two profoundest facts of Christ's redeeming work ; namely, the one efficacious oblation for sin, once offered, and the everlasting intercession. The first "he did once, when he offered up himself." Heb. vii, 27. "Now once in the end of the world hath he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself. And as it is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment ; so Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many." Heb. ix, 26-28. The second is seen in his unchangeable priesthood, whereby "he is able to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them." Heb. vii, 25. Compare also Rom. v, 10. So, in the exposition of these verses, we see Messiah set forth in the threefold character of Prophet, Priest, and King.

DISQUISITION.

In the foregoing exposition we have made little or no mention of interpretations differing from our own. If we have set forth the true exposition, all others are superseded, and it would be a needless labor to mention other views merely for the sake of refuting them, or saying that we differ from them. But there are three notable questions involved in this Scripture, which no interpreter has a right to ignore. They have been for centuries the subject of biblical and theological disquisition, and deserve our serious study. The first two are concerning the *Servant of Jehovah* ; who he is, and what the *nature of his sufferings*. The other is the question of the *authorship* of this portion of the Book of Isaiah.

I. The first question was long ago put to Philip, the evangelist, by an Ethiopian : "Of whom speaketh the prophet this ; of himself, or of some other man ?" Acts viii, 34. And we are

told that "Philip opened his mouth, and began at the same Scripture, and preached unto him Jesus." This we know to have been the exposition of the apostolic age, and universally maintained in the Christian Church for more than fifteen hundred years. This exposition we have set forth above, and shown how the prophet's words have a well-defined and accurate fulfillment in Jesus Christ, the Son of God and Saviour of men. The most ancient Jewish exposition, also, as Hengstenberg has abundantly shown in his Christology, referred the prophecy to the Messiah. And this exposition, we believe, would never have been abandoned by Judaism but for the fact that in controversy with the Christians it was seen to be otherwise impossible to resist the proof that Jesus was the Christ. Nor does the Messianic view meet opposition outside of Judaism except from those who deny the supernatural element in prophecy. But, having rejected the beautiful and self-consistent Messianic exposition, what do these opposers give us in its stead? There is, first, one class, who understand by Jehovah's servant, not an individual, but a collective body. But these represent at least five different expositions. The most popular is that of the Jewish rabbins Jarchi, Aben Ezra, and Kimchi, according to whom Jehovah's servant is the Jewish people, now scattered abroad among all nations, and exposed to insult and abuse. This view is adopted by many modern Germans, (Rosenmüller, Eichhorn, Hitzig,) who understand, however, the Babylonish exile of the Jews rather than their present dispersion. Besides the numerous difficulties with which this view is beset in explaining particular words and phrases, it is sufficiently refuted by an appeal to this one fact, which all the world knows, that the Jewish people, both in their present dispersion and former exile, suffered for their own, and not for others' sins. And so far from being led like an unresisting sheep to the slaughter, they have been notoriously obstinate and rebellious. Others, however, limit the reference to a portion or class of the Jewish people, as, for example, the pious and more spiritual, (Paulus, Maurer, Ewald, Knobel;) or the prophets, (De Wette, Winer;) or the priesthood. Eckermann understands the nation in the abstract, as distinguished from its individual members. And the Maccabees have also been adduced as meeting the description of the prophet. Each one of

these descriptions is open to particular objections, and they will be seen to refute each other if we take them one by one, and go through the whole passage asking such questions as the following: Did the pious Jews suffer more than others in exile? Did their stripes bring healing to the rest? In what particular sense did the prophets or priests grow up before Jehovah like a root from the dry earth, or lift the sicknesses or bear the sorrows of others? How could the nation be guilty, and its individual members innocent? When were the Maccabees dishonored and despised, and act like lepers hiding their faces in shame? or when and how did they ever take away sin and make intercession for sinners? The attempt to answer these, and many other questions which might be urged, shows the utterly unsatisfactory and conjectural character of the several opinions named.

There is another class of opposers of the Messianic exposition, who seem to see the difficulty of making the striking personal portraiture of the Servant represent a class or collective body, and therefore seek for some other individual, other than Jesus, who may be made to answer the prophet's description. Accordingly, the prophet himself, Uzziah, Hezekiah, Josiah, and Jeremiah have all been taken, by one or another of these interpreters, to be the servant described. But in what sense any one of the persons named sprinkled many nations, or was led as a sheep to the slaughter, or set forth his soul an offering for sin, it is difficult to see. Their utter lack of harmony in fixing on any one individual, and the far-fetched and unnatural interpretation put upon the prophet's words, lead us to think that the only fixed canon of criticism uniformly followed by this class of exegetes is, *any body rather than Jesus!* The inherent difficulties and indefiniteness of these various views are in noticeable contrast with the clear and wonderful fulfillment of every word and phrase in the Messianic exposition. But alas! a veil is on Israel's heart to-day, (2 Cor. iii, 15,) and we may still ask with the prophet, "Jehovah's arm, on whom is it uncovered?" Only by turning to the Lord Christ is the veil taken away.

II. But having satisfied ourselves that the Messianic exposition is the only true one, another question arises as to the nature of Messiah's sufferings. The question leads to a discussion

of one of the fundamental doctrines of Christian theology, the doctrine of *Vicarious Atonement*. But a scientific treatment of this Old Testament prophecy requires us to guard against introducing into it the refined definitions and distinctions of a later age. Let us not put into it what is not there, but let us be studious to draw from it what really is there. We will not forget that we are dealing with a lofty poem, in which we may not insist that every word and expression must have a special significance. But we will, also, bear in mind that all the intense passion of the poet is chastened with a solemn awe, and every strong word and metaphor and simile have been carefully selected; not revealed by flesh and blood. Matt. xvi, 17.

(1.) First, then, the sufferings here portrayed are *vicarious*. The just suffered for the unjust; the innocent for the guilty. No less than seven times is it said in one form or another that he suffered for the sake of others. Thus, he bore others' sorrows, (verse 4,) he was pierced for others' transgressions, crushed down for others' sins, chastised for others' peace, lacerated with stripes for the healing of others, (verse 5,) cut off for others' transgressions, (verse 8,) and made a curse for them. Manifestly, then, the suffering was vicarious, or substitutional, and verse 9 declares that the sufferer himself was guilty of no violence or wrong. His voluntary sufferings were accepted and reckoned as a substitute for penalty.

(2.) But, further, the sufferings and death were *expiatory*. They were, like the sin and trespass-offerings with which the Israelitish mind was familiar, piacular and propitiatory, and designed to atone for the guilt and transgressions of many. They appeased the divine wrath that burned against the sinners, and made satisfaction to the demands of righteousness. All this is clearly involved in such language as the following: "If thou set forth his soul an offering for sin," (verse 10,) "their sins he will bear," (verse 11,) "the sin of many he took away," (verse 12.) The only legitimate explanation of these forms of expression is that which finds abundant illustration in the expiatory sacrifices of the Mosaic system. And all this was strikingly fulfilled in Jesus Christ, who himself, as the Apostle Peter observes, "bore our sins in his own body on the tree." 1 Peter ii, 24.

(3.) To this it may be added, though the idea is really in-

volved in the foregoing observations, these sufferings are *mediatorial and intercessory*. For proof of this we need only refer the reader to our exposition of verses 6 and 12: "Jehovah mediated in him the sin of all of us," and "he for the sinners ever intercedes." The sufferings of the cross are consecrated into perpetual redeeming efficacy by the everlasting intercession. This Old Testament prophet probably did not comprehend "what or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ which was in him did signify," (1 Peter i, 11;) but we are satisfied that the only complete fulfillment of his words in these two verses is to be found in Jesus Christ, considered as the great High-priest who has entered into the heavenly holy of holies, "now to appear in the presence of God for us." Heb. ix, 24. His obedience, sufferings, death, resurrection, and ascension are all virtually embodied and represented in his "ever living to make intercession for us;" and only from this lofty exaltation can we see how "he shall sprinkle many nations."

III. Who, now let us ask, was the writer of this profoundest of all prophecies? It is natural for us to desire to know. The unsurpassed grandeur and sublimity of the writing and its deep and wondrous lessons would remain the same, even if the author were utterly unknown; but those who truly prize the matchless prophecy will not be content, without the clearest show of reason, to allow a saintly name, to whom it has been attributed by the unbroken tradition of two thousand years, to be robbed of his honor. Within the last century a large number of critics, chiefly German, have attempted to show that chapters xl-lxvi of the canonical Isaiah were not written by Isaiah the son of Amoz. It is quite generally agreed that these chapters are the work of a single author, and form a united whole, but must have been written later than the age of Isaiah, and during or after the Babylonish exile. And the unknown author has been called the "Pseudo-Isaiah," the "Later Isaiah," "Deutero-Isaiah," and "The Great Unnamed."

It is notable that almost invariably those critics that reject the Messianic exposition of chapter liii reject also the Isaiahan authorship of chapters xl-lxvi. And the great argument for assigning these chapters to a later age than that of Isaiah is the calling of Cyrus by name. Chaps. xlv, 28; xlv, 1. Manifestly this is the great difficulty with the rationalistic critics. They

will not allow a prediction that bears witness to a superhuman origin, and so they settle the whole question in advance by an *a priori* assumption. The ultimate question, therefore, becomes this: Is there a personal God, who at times interferes in supernatural and extraordinary ways with human affairs? If we say No, then must we resort to a naturalistic exposition of this and many other prophecies. But the holy Scriptures, from beginning to end, in one long multifarious answer, proclaim a God who at sundry times and in divers manners spoke to the fathers by the prophets. This forenaming of Cyrus is, indeed, extraordinary, and calculated to excite attention. But a careful scrutiny of our prophet's language (xliv, 26; xlv, 1-7) will bring out this issue: Either the writer truly prophesies of future things, or he is guilty of imposture. In calling Cyrus by name he assumes to be uttering a prophecy of a very extraordinary kind. A contemporary of Cyrus, uttering such language, would have exposed himself to contempt and ridicule. But the author's moral tone and sentiment are utterly incompatible with the perpetration of a pious fraud. And yet again and again does he profess to reveal the future. Comp. xli, 4, 22, 23; xlii, 9; xlv, 7, 8.

Other evidences of a post-exile date, it is claimed, are seen in those passages which represent Zion as a captive, and Jerusalem a desolation. Chaps. lii, 2; lviii, 12; lx, 9, 10; lxi, 4; lxii, 8; lxiv, 10, 11. In some of these passages allusion is undoubtedly made to the afflictions of the Babylonish exile, which Isaiah had specially foretold to Hezekiah, (chap. xxxix, 6;) but these allusions, like the prophecy concerning Cyrus, are but a small part of the great prophetic picture of Israel's future. Alexander calls attention to the fact that Babylon is less frequently mentioned than Egypt by Isaiah, and he wisely suggests that the oppressions and desolations described may be Egyptian or Roman as well as Babylonian. The seer has the past and the future of Israel, as the Old Testament Church, mapped out before his eye, and he shows himself familiar with all, as becomes one who speaks in the name of Him who is the First and the Last. Chaps. xli, 4; xlv, 6. If striking allusions to the Babylonish exile are pressed as evidences of late authorship, then may we urge the marvelous portraiture of Jesus of Nazareth in chapter liii, and insist on the same ground that this

must have been written after Jesus had suffered on the cross, and after Paul had expounded the mysteries of redemption.

The argument based on the peculiar style and diction of these chapters is of too uncertain a character to prove any thing. The citation of fancied Chaldaisms and of *ἅπαξ λεγόμενα* produce an artificial glare confusing to some minds, but are utterly misleading as evidences of authorship. The subject-matter of these prophecies would naturally beget a tone of peculiar majesty, and Knobel himself admits that their style greatly resembles that of the genuine Isaiah. As for the plea that they contain doctrines and sentiments belonging to an age later than that of Isaiah, it is quite sufficient to reply, Nay, these passages themselves show that such sentiments were current in Isaiah's day?

Over against all these critics we finally posit the unanimous verdict of all Jewish and Christian tradition as far back as there is any trace, and ask the candid reader to weigh it as against the hypothesis of a post-exile authorship and a pseudo-Isaiah. "That a writer confessedly of the highest genius," observes Alexander, "living at one of the most critical junctures in the history of Israel, when the word of God began to be precious and prophetic inspiration rare, should have produced such a series of prophecies as this, with such effects upon the exiles and even upon Cyrus as tradition ascribes to them, and then have left them to the admiration of all future ages, without so much as a trace of his own personality about them, is a phenomenon of literary history compared with which the mystery of Junius is as nothing."

Some critics have urged, as against the traditional authorship of these later chapters, that in the Talmud Isaiah is placed after Jeremiah and Ezekiel. But far back of the Talmud, and two centuries or more before the birth of Jesus of Nazareth, the son of Sirach wrote of these three great prophets, placing Isaiah first, and calling him "the great prophet, who was also faithful in his vision. By a great spirit," he adds, "he saw the last things, and comforted the mourners in Zion. He showed what should come to pass forever, and secret things before they came to light." Ecclesiasticus xlviii, 22-25. And thus, as prince among the prophets, have all subsequent ages held him. In loftiness of thought, in splendor of diction, and in profound in-

tuition of the yearnings of the human heart, he stands unrivaled, his enemies themselves being judges. And doubtless as the world grows older, mightier and mightier will grow this great evangelical prophet, this comforter of Zion, this winged psalmist of humanity's holiest hopes.

Minstrel sublime! Thy God anointed thee
Above thy fellow-prophets. All thy words
Are polished amethysts, and, like the glass
Of him that revels with the golden stars,
Bring to our vision worlds unknown before.
Immortal seer! What glory filled thine eye!
What myriad melodies possess thy harp,
That angels linger in their flights to hear
Thy oracles divine. Sound on, ye hymns
Prophetic; ages yet to come will hear,
As ages past heard, in these lofty strains
The Spirit's voice, and hearing, will believe
That Jesus is the very Christ of God.

ART. IV.—HARMAN'S INTRODUCTION.

An Introduction to the Study of the Holy Scriptures. By HENRY M. HARMAN, D.D., Professor of Ancient Languages and Literature in Dickinson College. Edited by GEORGE R. CROOKS, D.D., and JOHN F. HURST, D.D. New York: Phillips & Hunt. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. 1879.

AROUND any ancient monument the dust of centuries has settled, until its base is buried out of sight. In order to judge of the proportions of such a monument, or to ascertain how securely it stands, we must dig down to its foundations, and bring to light its buried parts. Troy could never have been understood by studying the Iliad only; Dr. Schliemann's pick and shovel must prepare the way for a proper appreciation of the city of Priam.

The same thing is true of any old book. Time works such changes in language, in the manners and customs of the people, and in the relative position of the nations, that in a few centuries a large part of the book becomes buried lore. Almost every author leaves great chasms in his writings to be bridged over by facts and opinions commonly known and accepted. But these facts and opinions in course of time sink out of sight, and others widely different are superimposed. In a few cent-

uries the bridges which connected the headlands of the narrative are all gone, and the new circumstances have either left the chasm with nothing to join its opposite banks, or have filled it up so high with *débris* that it is utterly impassable. The book thus becomes fragmentary, disconnected, and contradictory; nor is it possible to vindicate its integrity and give it a plain and consistent meaning except by reproducing in thought the state of things which existed at the time it was written. But this will require no little digging and delving in the lore of the past, and will necessitate the exhuming of the age in which, and the people among which, the book first made its appearance.

The Bible is the oldest of all authentic books, and for that reason presents many difficulties requiring explanation before it can be thoroughly understood. Moreover, its several parts were written in different ages of the world, and in various countries. And then it was all penned by men of a widely different race from us, having modes of thought and forms of expression peculiar to the East. When we remember that the governments under which these writers lived have perished from off the face of the earth, and that the Hebrew people no longer inhabit the country which then was theirs, we should expect to find more difficulty in interpreting the Bible than in any other book. One half of that old monument is buried beneath the drifting, shifting sands of time, and we can but very imperfectly judge of its symmetry as a whole, or of the strength of its base, by the portion which now remains above ground. It requires more learning and more labor to remove the accumulations of time from the Bible, and lay bare the manners and customs which were contemporaneous with its writers, than are demanded for the elucidation of any other ancient document. If, however, the labor and learning thus spent shall result in discovering that the shaft is a monolith, and that it rests upon the Rock of ages, the reward will be more than commensurate with the toil.

The necessity for a re-examination of the claims and contents of the Bible, for the purpose of directing attention and thought to its sacred truths, is made apparent by the attempt on the part of skeptical scientists to ignore and divert attention from this volume of our faith. Mr. James C. Southall says: "There

is a certain want of ingenuousness among many literary and scientific men with regard to the historical books of the Hebrew Scriptures which is reprehensible, and for which I have little respect. They studiously avoid all mention of these documents, when if they had been discovered in the valley of the Euphrates or the Nile they would receive great attention. I do not recollect that the 'Antiquity of Man' ever recognizes that the book of Genesis is in existence, and yet every one is perfectly conscious that the author has it in mind, and is writing *at it* all the time." * The testimony of the book no less than that of the rocks requires careful study in order to be understood, and the Church, therefore, ought to put forth as much effort to concentrate thought upon the Bible as the world does to keep the discoveries of physical science ever before the mind. At a time like this, when skepticism is endeavoring to turn the current of thought away from revelation, the publication of an exhaustive "Introduction to the Study of the Holy Scriptures" is not only a valuable contribution to sacred literature, but also a priceless boon to all sincere inquirers after the truth.

Henry M. Harman, D.D., Professor of Ancient Languages and Literature in Dickinson College, is the first American scholar who has undertaken this stupendous work. Indeed, we had almost come to think that the time and patience required in the production of such a book were too great for the push and hurry of the American character, and that they could only be matched by the bull-dog perseverance of the English, or the tireless sitting capacity of the German character.

Dr. Nast gave us an admirable "Introduction to the Gospels" a few years since, but that was only a part of the great work that was needed, and, after all, its author was not a native of America, having had his birth in the Fatherland. The appearance, therefore, of Dr. Harman's "Introduction to the Study of the Holy Scriptures" within the last year is matter both of Christian gratitude and national pride.

The vast and varied erudition which he brings to this task makes him master of the situation, while his indomitable patience and perseverance never tire in exposing error and in tracking truth to its source. He seems equally at home in all the languages of the East, both ancient and modern. Greek,

* Preface to "The Recent Origin of Man," p. 10.

Hebrew, Egyptian and Assyrian archæology are all at his fingers' ends. The discoveries of science and the testimony of travelers furnish a fund of knowledge on which he draws at will, and his thorough acquaintance with all that has been written by those who have preceded him in this particular department of study makes him quick to profit by the admissions of enemies and to take warning from the errors of friends. Indeed, his stores of antique and curious learning fit him for a task like this almost beyond a rival.

At the very outset of his Introduction he parts company with atheists and with the Tübingen school of critics, demanding in his readers belief in the existence of a God, and in the possibility of a supernatural revelation. He thus states the plan and scope of his work :

It is our purpose, in the present volume, to examine the Genuineness, Credibility, Integrity, Language, Contents, and most important Ancient Versions of the Canonical Books of the Bible. An inquiry of such a nature travels over a long period of human history. We are to consider books extending through a period of more than fifteen hundred years, the earliest of which appeared at the dawn of history, and the last were composed when the Roman Empire and Pagan Civilization were at their zenith of power. In the treatment of such a subject much depends upon the frame of mind with which it is approached. If our speculative system excludes from the universe an ever-living, free, supreme Intelligence, the Creator and Preserver of all that is, and acknowledges nothing but unintelligent physical forces, upon whose play all things depend, we are wholly unfit to deal fairly with the Sacred Canon. For in such a case Revelation, Miracles, and Prophecies are palpable absurdities. But Atheism can never be a positive affirmation ; and if the natural phenomena of the world furnished no proof of a personal God, we could yet philosophically admit the evidence which the facts of the Bible give of his existence. No *real Theist* can consistently deny the possibility of revelation, with its accompanying proofs—miracles and prophecies—and hence he is ever ready to listen to the evidence of the genuineness of documents that establish them. Nor will he take offense at a *written* revelation, when he reflects that it is by means of *books*, in the order of Providence, that mankind are instructed in the various affairs of the world.—P. 17.

Granted the existence of God and the possibility of a written revelation, our author sets out to determine what claim our Scriptures have to be regarded as such written revelation from God. In deciding a question like this the stream of inquiry

divides, as we follow it up, into three branches, namely, external, internal, and collateral evidence. These branches, however, flow so close together that, follow which one you will, the other two will always be in sight.

Dr. Harman does not attempt to complete the consideration of either one of these branches of evidence to the exclusion of the other two, but seems to delight in keeping them all constantly before the mind, so that their united force may be felt. He cannot, of course, avoid pursuing separately lines of inquiry which belong to one or the other of these classes of evidence, and for the time being must close his ears to all other voices, but it will not be long before he returns to bring up the other lines abreast with this. His mode of treatment reminds one of a skillful lawyer presenting his evidence to a jury. He does not divide it up into sections and bring all the witnesses who are to testify to any fact upon the stand in immediate succession, but so arranges the order of his witnesses that the testimony of each will serve to explain and confirm that of all the others. He may first bring a witness to identify a document; then he will read the instrument and put it in evidence; next he may call a witness to swear to the signature; then he will prove that the party admitted upon a certain occasion that he had executed such an instrument; then he will show in whose custody it has been kept from the time it was executed; next he will return to the document, and will establish from its orthography and grammar a correspondence with other papers executed by this party; and, finally, he may prove the fact that the party was in the place named at the time the instrument purports to have been executed, and that it was generally reputed to be his act, without any denial on his part.

He will so interweave external, internal, and collateral evidence that each will be supported by the other, and that the case will be sustained by the combined force of the testimony.

In the case of the holy Scriptures the first question which demands an answer is, Whence came the books which make up the Bible? They did not fall from the moon, they were not brought to earth by an angel, they were not revealed by some supernatural light in a cave of the mountain. We hold them to be the word of God; but how came we in possession of them? To answer this question our author proceeds to follow the

stream of revelation up to the several springs whose waters swell the great current. And, just here, I cannot refrain from expressing my gratification that in almost every instance he has gone to original sources for his information, and has given us the original text, either in the body of the book or in copious foot-notes. Nothing new could be said upon this head, for the facts are patent to all; but the disposition and arrangement of the facts, so as to give them their greatest force, is very skillfully made.

Confining his inquiries in the first part of the book to the Old Testament, it becomes of the utmost importance to determine the canon of the Hebrew Scriptures. It were manifestly a waste of time and labor to investigate books which never attained to the dignity of sacred writings among the Jews themselves; and so the sacred writings which have come down to us need sifting before we examine their claim to be the word of God. For this purpose our author travels through every ancient catalogue of the Old Testament—from that of Melito to that of St. Jerome. As the last mentioned catalogue is the one on which he bases the canon of the Old Testament, it may not be regarded as out of place to insert it here:

Of all the fathers of the early Church Jerome was the greatest Hebrew scholar, and the best versed in the literature of the Jews. His testimony as to the canon of the Old Testament is, therefore, very valuable. In the preface to his translation of the two Books of Samuel and of the two Books of Kings he furnishes a catalogue of books of the Old Testament as arranged in the Hebrew Bible, giving both the Hebrew and the Greek or Latin name of each. He gives, first, the five books of Moses, which he says are called *TORAH—LAW*. The second division, he says, is that of the *PROPHETS*, and he begins with Joshua the son of Nun. Next comes the Book of Judges, with that of Ruth in the same volume. The third book is that of Samuel, called First and Second Kings with us. The fourth book is that of Kings, contained in the third and fourth volume of Kings; fifth, Isaiah; sixth, Jeremiah; seventh, Ezekiel. Then come the Twelve (Minor) Prophets. The third division, says he, contains the *Ἁγίωγραφα*, *HAGIOGRAPHHA*, (*Holy Writings*). The first book is Job; next, Psalms of David, in one volume; three books of Solomon, namely, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and Song of Songs; First and Second Chronicles; Ezra; and the ninth, Esther. "Thus the books of the ancient law," says he, "are twenty-two: five of Moses, eight of the Prophets, and nine of the *Hagiographa*; although some often insert Ruth and the Lamentations in the *Hagiographa*, . . . and thus the books

of the ancient law would be twenty-four." In this catalogue are all the books that we have in our present canon of the Old Testament, and no others; Nehemiah is included in Ezra, and the Lamentations are included in the prophecy of Jeremiah. Jerome remarks on this catalogue: "Whatever is outside of these must be placed among the Apocrypha. Therefore Wisdom, which is commonly inscribed the 'Wisdom of Solomon,' and the Book of Jesus the Son of Sirach, and Judith, and Tobias, are not in the canon. The First Book of Maccabees I have found in Hebrew. The Second Book is in Greek." He observes, in his preface to Jeremiah, that "The Book of Baruch has no existence among the Hebrews, and the spurious Epistle of Jeremiah I have determined should be by no means commented upon."—P. 30.

From these Christian authorities he turns to Jewish testimony for confirmatory evidence of the Old Testament canon. It so happens that the writings of Josephus and Philo have preserved for us catalogues more or less perfect of the books held as sacred by the Jews in their day. Another is found incorporated in the prologue of the Greek translation of the Wisdom of Jesus the Son of Sirach, while the Talmuds furnish a fourth. These are all forced to bear their testimony to the canonicity of the books of our Old Testament.

Alongside these Jewish and early Christian catalogues he next marshals the ancient manuscripts of the Jewish Scriptures; and after them the many ancient versions—the Septuagint, the Targums, the Peshito, the Itala, the Vulgate, the Egyptian, the Ethiopic, the Armenian, the Georgian, the Gothic, the Slavonian, and the Arabic—together with the Samaritan Pentateuch and its versions. Early Christian literature is ransacked for information upon this subject, and every passage found bearing upon the canon of the Scriptures is made to take its place in this book. We are compelled to wade knee-deep among old Hebrew MSS., and through tomes of musty translations in all the languages of the Babel East. The conflict between these early authorities soon eliminates the Apocrypha, and leaves us the Old Testament canon in its integrity as we now have it.

Having thus determined the canon of the Hebrew Scriptures as a whole, our author next resolves the Old Testament into its several components, and regards each book as a separate document for the purpose of making each succeeding author bear testimony to the writings of his predecessor, so as to fix ap-

proximately the date of the oldest books of the Bible. In other words, he traces the volume as a whole book to within sight of its latest writer—farther than this it could not be traced, because it did not exist in its integrity—and from this point, taking each sacred author as an independent authority, he climbs, step by step, by means of their testimony, up the stair of evidence to the days of the Exodus and the writing of the Pentateuch.

Paley's argument from quotations and allusions must forever be conclusive.* Any quotation from a book is proof unanswerable that that book was extant at the time the quotation was made. Well, by means of direct quotations from, or clear allusions to, or direct mention of, the Pentateuch, in the several books of the Old Testament, our author follows the Books of Moses back to the days of Joshua, who mentions them as writings well understood and of acknowledged authority among the people at that time. With the testimony of Joshua he closes the evidence from sacred authors, and concludes as follows:

It may be taken for granted that Moses was the great legislator of the Hebrews, since the proof is so strong that it may be said to have hardly ever been questioned. All the writings of the Jews, and their oldest traditions, agree that Moses was their lawgiver; and the Egyptians, Greeks, and Romans held the same view. Manetho, an Egyptian priest of Sebennytus, a man of great erudition, who wrote in Greek, about B. C. 300, the Egyptian History from their sacred writings, states that the Israelites left Egypt in the reign of Amenophis, and that their leader, a priest of Heliopolis, by name Osarsiphus—whose name was changed to *Moses* after he went over to the Israelites—*gave them laws*, for the most part contrary to the customs of Egypt, enjoining upon them not to worship the gods, nor to abstain from those animals held sacred in Egypt, but to sacrifice and slaughter them all. King Amenophis (Amenoph) is placed by Wilkinson at B. C. 1498-1478. Manetho's History of the Dynasties has been remarkably confirmed by the monuments of Egypt. Strabo, the great Greek geographer, (about B. C. 65,) in speaking of the Jews, remarks: "Moses, one of the Egyptian priests, possessing a part of Lower Egypt, left there, being disgusted with the existing institutions, and many, honoring the Divinity, left with him. For he said and taught that the Egyptians have not just conceptions of the Divine nature in representing it by beasts and cattle; nor have the Lybians; nor have the Greeks, who represent it by human forms. For that only is God which embraces us all, both land and sea."

The Roman satirist Juvenal (about A.D. 100) speaks of "the

* "Evidences of Christianity," p. 134.

law, all which Moses delivered in the sacred volume." "Moses," says Tacitus, "gave the Jewish nation new rites, contrary to those of other men."—P. 71.

Having thus established the antiquity and integrity of these books, the question as to their genuineness next arises. In this field Dr. Harman's scythe cuts a broad swath. His intimate acquaintance with the state of ancient learning in all the countries which enter into this question, and his knowledge of the manners, customs, and languages of the peoples concerned, enable him largely to reproduce the state of society which existed in the days of the Exodus. He is not writing a work on the evidences of Christianity, and hence his book is not polemical in tone. He is preparing the way for the study of the holy Scriptures, and therefore contents himself with the task of removing causes of misapprehension, and with restoring, as far as may be, the ancient settings and surroundings of the Bible. He does not aim at dovetailing propositions into syllogisms for the purpose of forcing conclusions. He rather assigns to himself the task of collecting the materials out of which arguments are constructed. His arrangement of these materials is rather in the form of pictures of ancient society than in the shape of demonstrations of formal propositions. Reading his work, before we know it we feel at home among the patriarchs, and the meaning of lawgiver, psalmist, and prophet dawns upon us we know not how. The best possible explanation of an author's meaning is a knowledge of the circumstances under which the book was written. Thus (on page 67) he hedges in the Pentateuch :

As a preliminary to the discussion of the genuineness of the Pentateuch, there arises the question of the antiquity of the art of alphabetical writing among the Hebrews : for if it can be shown that the art was well-known among that people in the Mosaic age, the probability that their great lawgiver *wrote* his laws will be very great.

Writing in hieroglyphics, which preceded alphabetical writing, was known and practiced in Egypt at a very remote period. The sacred books of Thoth, the Egyptian Mercury or Hermes, were written, in part at least, as early as the time of Suphis, (Cheops,) to whom the books were attributed. This Memphitic king, according to Wilkinson, reigned about B. C. 2450. Numerous commentaries were written on these sacred books of Thoth. "Papyri are of the most remote Pharaonic periods, and the same mode of

writing on them is shown from the sculptures to have been common in the age of Suphis, or Cheops, the builder of the Great Pyramid." "Every thing was done in writing." They had decimal as well as duodecimal calculation, and the reckoning by units, tens, hundreds, and thousands, before the pyramids were built. Alphabetical writing came into use several centuries later. "From the Palestinians the people near the Mediterranean Sea received their alphabet. The sounds of the alphabet itself, as it is known to us, suit well the general lingual characteristics of the Semites. It corresponds to their peculiarity, for it expresses their inclination to gutturals, and the variety of their hissing or aspirated sounds. We can, therefore, assert with high probability that *its inventor was a Semitic*." That the Israelites possessed alphabetical writing when they went down into Egypt is quite evident, otherwise they would have adopted the hieroglyphic system of the Egyptians. The Phœnicians, who lived on the borders of Canaan, and whose language was nearly the same as the Hebrew, possessed writing at a very remote period. They attributed the invention of their alphabet to Taut, their world-god. The sacred writings of the Phœnicians, in which their cosmogony, the history of their gods and heroes, natural events, and astronomical, astrological, and psychological doctrines were contained, were called Taut-writings. Antiquity mentions seven such writings.

The existence of alphabetical writing among the Hebrews at the time of the Exodus being thus established, he proceeds to draw a picture of the arts and sciences in general in Egypt in the Mosaic age, to show that the statements of the Pentateuch respecting the arts employed by the Israelites in building the tabernacle, in making its utensils, and in adorning the priests, together with the allusions made to gold and other ornaments, are natural and credible, unless one can suppose that the Israelites, although dwelling in close proximity to the Egyptians for centuries, never learned any of their arts, and that no Egyptian artist ever appeared among them.

These collateral considerations create a strong presumption both that Moses wrote laws for the Jews and that the Pentateuch contains those laws. And now our author turns to the evidences of genuineness to be found in the books themselves. Having argued the unity of the Pentateuch from the one plan which pervades it all, showing it to be the work of one mind, he next proceeds to demonstrate its antiquity from the *archaisms* which it contains. I do not recollect ever to have seen so thorough and exhaustive a presentation of this class of evidence as is found in this book. Indeed, the chap-

ters upon this subject I regard as the gems of the whole volume. They give evidence of an amount of learning, labor, and patience which few men possess, and furnish an argument for the antiquity and genuineness of the Pentateuch which few minds can resist.

Language is a long-lived thing, but it has its youth, maturity, and decrepitude, like men and nations. The seasons in its life-time may be centuries, but they mark different stages of its development or decline. A language that had well-nigh perished may sometimes be revived and perpetuated for centuries, but its youth or maturity can never be restored when once it has been passed. Though the English tongue should become universal, and should continue to be spoken to the end of time, it would never again be characterized by the language of Spenser and Chaucer. A language may reach a second childhood, like an individual, but the second will be very unlike the first. Because language is thus ceaselessly progressive, the style, the idioms, the grammar, and the very words of any composition will go far toward determining the age in which it was written. A document found to-day written in English containing many obsolete words and forms of expression, together with antiquated spelling and strange grammatical forms, but containing no word or syllable that was not pure Anglo-Saxon, would unquestionably be assigned to a period prior to the Norman Conquest, and subsequent to the Anglo-Saxon ascendancy in England. The ages of stone and of bronze do not more clearly mark successive stages in a people's civilization than do the peculiarities of the language in which a book is written determine the age to which it belongs. Dr. Harman, with consummate skill, has collected and arranged the archaisms of the Pentateuch for the double purpose of establishing the antiquity of the Books of Moses and the unity of their authorship. We think he conclusively shows, not only that the books must have been written in the infancy of the Hebrew language, but that the same peculiarities run through all five of the books, and are not found in any other Hebrew books of great antiquity, thus showing these books to have been written by one and the same author.

The genuineness of these books being thus clearly indicated, our author next turns to examine the objections which have

been offered against the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch. Of the *document* hypothesis of the origin of the Pentateuch, he disposes as follows :

Respecting the document hypothesis, we may remark, first of all, that there is very little agreement, as we have already seen, among the opponents of the genuineness of the Pentateuch in regard to the *number* of the original documents, *when* they were composed, by *whom* and from *what* sources, and *when* the final revision of the whole was made. This want of unity in view is a strong proof that their theories rest upon no solid basis of facts. One feature, however, stands out prominently in nearly all their theories : they deprive Moses, as much as possible, of all connection with the composition of the Pentateuch.

The different names for the Divine Being—*Elohim*, *God*, *Jehovah*, (properly *Jahveh*), and *Jehovah Elohim* (LORD GOD, Eng. Ver.)—found in different portions of the Book of Genesis, furnish the original ground for the decomposition of the Mosaic writings. In the other books of the Pentateuch (with the exception of the first few chapters of Exodus) the use of the divine names furnishes no support at all for the document hypothesis. But it must be borne in mind that the hypothesis that one document or more entered into the composition of the Book of Genesis and into the first two chapters of Exodus, by no means militates against the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch. That the traditions of the Hebrew people would be written down during their sojourn in Egypt, where they came in contact with a people who were accustomed to write the annals of their kings, and to compose works on science and religion, is highly probable. Joseph, who married the daughter of Poti-pherah, priest of On, might have compiled the annals of the Hebrews and the traditions respecting the deluge and the antediluvian world. But those annals might have been very defective, and have contained no account, or a very imperfect one, of the work of creation, the order of which none but God could know. The original document lying before Moses—for we can scarcely believe it at all probable that the Hebrews had two different documents which related the history of the world from the creation to the time of Moses—may have been used by him in the composition of Genesis. In this way we might find in Genesis a narrator, (*the Elohist*), and an editor or reviser, the *Jehovist*, (*Moses*.) How far this is probably true must be determined from the phenomena exhibited in the book.—P. 88.

After patiently exposing the absurdity of Bishop Colenso's strictures, one by one, he finally takes leave of him with this remark : "There is one peculiarity of Colenso which must be noticed. Whenever any subject admits of different views or explanations, the one which creates a difficulty or absurdity is

almost invariably adopted by him. No other document of either the ancient or modern world would be treated in the same way."—P. 217.

Curious objections by the score are satisfactorily answered, and apparent discrepancies harmonized, until the ground is completely cleared of obstacles to the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch. At last he opens the books of the Pentateuch, and shows that *they claim* to have been written by Moses, while no rival author has ever arisen to dispute the claim. Finally, to place the divine seal upon these old books, he turns to Jesus Christ and his apostles for their testimony:

Our Saviour and his apostles every-where assume the Mosaic authorship and the divine authority of the Pentateuch. Our Saviour, in his controversy with the Jews, says: "For had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed me: for *he wrote* of me. But if ye believe not his writings, how shall ye believe my words?" How absurd this language would be, on the theory that the Pentateuch was written ages after Moses.—If you do not believe in a work made up of traditions and myths in a late age and attributed to Moses, how can ye believe in me?—and this language from Him who is the *truth* itself!

In various passages Christ speaks also of Moses as if he was the author of the Pentateuch: "Have ye not read in *the book of Moses*, how in the bush God spake unto him saying, I am the God of Abraham," etc. Mark xii, 26. "If they hear not *Moses* and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded though one rose from the dead." Luke xvi, 31. "These are the words which I spake unto you while I was yet with you, that all things must be fulfilled which were written in *the law of Moses*," etc. Luke xxiv, 44. "Did not *Moses* give you *the law*?" John vii, 19.

The Apostle Peter, on the day of Pentecost, says: "For *Moses* truly said unto the fathers, A Prophet shall the Lord your God raise up unto you of your brethren, like unto me," etc. Acts iii, 22.

The Apostle Paul, in his address to Agrippa, observes in respect to his teaching: "Saying none other things than those which the prophets and *Moses did say* should come." Acts xxvi, 22. And in Acts xxviii, 23, St. Paul expounded "both out of *the law of Moses* and out of the prophets." "For *Moses* describeth (Greek, *writes*) the righteousness which is of the law, that the man which doeth these things shall live by them." Rom. x, 5. This refers to Lev. xviii, 5, which St. Paul here declares that Moses wrote. "For even unto this day, when *Moses* is read, the veil is upon their heart." 2 Cor. iii, 15.—Pp. 224, 225.

The inspiration of the Pentateuch is left to be inferred from its contents. If it be a trustworthy history of the events which

it records, there is no escaping the conclusion that Moses was a divinely inspired man. Men always have believed and will believe to the end of time that God is on the side of truth. Whenever, therefore, they behold God's omniscience cropping out in prophecy or his omnipotence laid bare in miracles, they will believe in the truth of the man or the message in attestation of which the prophecy was uttered or the miracle performed. There could have been no deception in the miracles performed during the exodus. It was not a matter of faith but of positive knowledge with the Jews that the Red Sea parted at Moses' command. There could have been no mistake about the manna which fell, and on which they were fed. They knew whether the waters gushed forth from the rock when Moses smote it, or not; and they knew absolutely whether their clothing waxed not old throughout all their journeyings. There could have been no mistake about these and similar miracles; and the Jews would not have accepted as true the Pentateuch which contained these accounts, nor bowed obedience to its laws, had these miracles not occurred in their knowledge. But admit these miraculous interpositions of divine power through Moses, and at once he becomes the accredited agent and mouth-piece of God.

The authenticity and inspiration of the books of Moses, like the Siamese twins, are vitally united, and are, therefore, inseparable. If the books are not trustworthy histories of the events which they record, of course they are not divinely inspired. But if, on the other hand, we accept their statement of facts as true, it follows irresistibly that God breathed his own wisdom into their author, and clothed him at times with almighty power. The nature of the history determines the inspiration of the author. But the narrative of events in the Pentateuch cannot be rejected as authentic history according to any rule of criticism which would not destroy belief in all ancient history. The miraculous events, upon which the proof of Moses' inspiration rests, and about which there could have been no deception, have been attested by every Jewish writer from Moses down to the close of the sacred canon—they have been celebrated by the Jews in sacred songs, and commemorated by religious institutions and festivals through all the ages which have intervened since the events are related to have occurred.

The country over which Moses and Israel passed, in their flight from Egypt, bears names to the present day which are the echo of the miraculous events of the Exodus, and the atmosphere of Egypt and Arabia is still full of traditions respecting these events. With all these evidences corroborating the Mosaic record, it is not possible rationally to withhold assent to the authenticity of the Pentateuch. And since its authenticity establishes miracles and prophecy, the inspiration of Moses follows inevitably.

It is too late to object to the possibility of miracles and prophecy when the one has been performed and the other fulfilled before our eyes. De Wette saw and acknowledged that the Mosaic narrative enfolds the miraculous like a garment. He says: "If it is at least doubtful to the thinking intellect that such miracles really occurred, the question arises whether they did not so appear to the eye-witnesses and participants of the history; or were supposed by the reporters to have occurred in a natural way, but set forth in a poetic-miraculous light? But this must be denied as soon as the narratives are carefully considered. For there is wholly wanting in them that credulous poetic frame of mind which would contain the key to the miraculous." *

Bishop Colenso's general objection to miracles is a weak thing to dispute the power of Moses' rod. It is thus stated and annihilated by our author, (pages 218, 219:)—

"The order," says he, "of this wondrous universe, so manifold, so diverse, yet all tending to unity, to one great central Cause, a miracle, if really witnessed, would be like a jarring discord in the midst of a mighty music—not a sign of the master-musician's presence, but a token that for once he had failed to subdue the rebellious elements—would, in short, be simply frightful."† What shall we say to a miracle's being "a jarring discord in the midst of a mighty music?" Is this world nothing but harmonious music? What shall we say of earthquakes burying whole cities with thousands of human beings; of inundations laying waste vast tracts and destroying human life; of famines, pestilences, tornadoes, sweeping away houses, and sending ships with their precious freight beneath the waves of the deep? Is all this music in the ears and harmony to the eyes of Colenso? To these discordant and destructive forces add the passions of men, exhibited in horri-

* Schrader's De Wette's "Einleitung," p. 257.

† "Lectures on the Pentateuch," etc., p. 369.

ble wars and devastations. In the midst of such a world as this, is an extraordinary display of omnipotent power in punishing the wicked and delivering the good—the manifestation of the divine power and Godhead, the revelation of Jehovah to man, a great light in the midst of moral darkness—is all this nothing but a jarring discord? In the midst of the wrongs and the darkness of the world, who has not felt, as did Isaiah, and prayed, “O that thou wouldest rend the heavens, that thou wouldest come down?”

The bed rock of the Bible has thus been reached; and, having found the Pentateuch to be the WORD of GOD, it is comparatively easy to determine, approximately, the age, genuineness and inspiration of the remaining books of the Old Testament.

To undertake to give an adequate idea of our author's treatment of these several books would be to transcribe a large part of his work. Suffice it to say, that the same thorough scholarship and careful research are brought to bear upon every portion of the Old Testament; and if in every case we do not agree with the conclusions of his logic, we cannot help being edified and profited by his learning.

His Introduction to the New Testament, which occupies the latter part of his work, does for the four Gospels what the course of investigation pursued in the case of the Pentateuch did for the Books of Moses. His examination of the authorities bearing upon the authenticity of the Gospels is thorough and exhaustive, and his accumulation of facts for the defense of the Gospels leaves nothing to be desired. But as the treatment of the New Testament is similar to the course pursued with the Old, it does not fall within the scope of this article to enter further into its discussion.

That the book is free from errors is not claimed, nor is it hoped that all the conclusions reached by the author will be accepted by orthodox Christians; but it contains so much that is rare and valuable that we can easily afford to overlook its defects. Dr. Harman is a scholar rather than a logician. The treasury of learning which he has given us in this volume is almost faultless. The mistakes are nearly all in the conclusions which he draws from indisputable premises. Without indorsing every thing contained in the book, we regard the volume, as a whole, as a grand contribution to sacred literature, and as an armory of truth from which the weapons of our warfare will be taken for a generation to come.

ART. V.—ECHOES FROM AFRICA.

The American Missionary. December, 1878; January and February, 1879. American Missionary Association. New York.

The Three Despised Races in the United States. An Address by JOSEPH COOK. American Missionary Association. New York. 1878.

"THE fate of the negro," it has been said, "is the romance of our age." The events which have transpired in his history since the great emancipation in the United States, and which are now transpiring, are in the highest degree romantic. There will always gather around the history of the race a pathetic interest, which must ever kindle the imagination, touch the heart, and awaken the sympathies of all in whom there is a spark of humanity.

The intelligence we have just received from America of large migrations of negroes from the Southern to the Western States is full of melancholy and suggestive interest. To reflecting minds acquainted with the history of Southern society during the last fifty years these events are not surprising. Retributive justice may linger, but it is sure. A prosperity built up on the wrongs of a race, by the unrequited labor of a whole people, ought not to have been expected to be permanent. In 1858 the chivalry of Louisiana passed a law forbidding free blacks to come in; now they would pass a law forbidding them to go out.

"Many years ago," we are informed by a writer of Southern birth,

"an artist of Philadelphia was engaged by the State of South Carolina to paint some national emblematic picture for her State-house. Jefferson Davis was requested to act with the South Carolina Committee at Washington in criticising the studies for this work. The most creditable sketch presented was a design representing the North by various mechanical implements; the West by a prairie and plow; while the South was represented by various things, the center-piece, however, being a cotton-bale with a negro upon it fast asleep. When Mr. Davis saw it, he said, 'Gentlemen, this will never do; what will become of the South when the negro wakes up?'"

The discussions which the reconstruction laws have made possible in the South, the circulation of newspapers, the education of negro youth as preachers and teachers, have roused

the negro, and started him to his feet. The thunders of the civil war awoke him from his profound slumber; but he lay on the cotton-bale with his eyes open, uncertain where he was. The man who has been suddenly roused from a long sleep takes some time to recover himself. The negro is now up—stupid yet from a protracted and undisturbed slumber—but he is up, and wants to adjust his relations to the cotton-bale upon an equitable footing, or leave the bale and its owner to their fate. Hence the exodus and migration idea, which menaces the South in every department of its organic life. And this is a specially inopportune moment for the carrying out of such an idea on any thing like a large scale. The prosperity of the South has been rapidly returning under free labor, and was being placed on a satisfactory and enduring basis. Mr. Jefferson Davis lately declared that the ex-slave-holders were so far satisfied with the change that they would not, if they could, revert to the former system. And yet the owners of these reviving estates have been so unwise and reckless as to adopt such a system of treatment as has spread dissatisfaction among their hands. And, from all we can gather, this harsh and oppressive treatment has not been of a hap-hazard or isolated character, but the result of a deep-laid scheme. The plan seems to have been so to impoverish their laborers as to make them helplessly dependent, to check by a tyrannical repression the normal impulse of advance, to arrest the people through their elementary needs at a capriciously chosen point in their progress, and *fix* them in it, and thus bring about a species of serfdom very little better than the former bondage. Rev. Joseph Cook, the celebrated Boston lecturer, in an address before the American Association, furnishes the following information:

Last summer, on Lake Chautauqua, while I had a little leisure, I fell into conversation with one of the acutest members of Washington society—I dare not describe him more definitely—and he said to me: "The negro is getting in debt. He is a peasant; he rents land; he has only very small wages; he buys his groceries at a store owned by his landlord, and runs up a bill there; and the silent scheme of the South is to get the negro in debt. Then he cannot very well leave town until his debts are paid. He becomes a fixture, in many cases, because of his indebtedness; and, to make the story short, sir," said my informant, "some of us fear that fifty years hence a considerable portion of the freed-

men will be in a state of peonage. They will be bankrupt tenants under the power of landlords. And it is often whispered in the South that this will be the next best thing to the restoration of slavery."*

No people having their eyes open and standing on their feet would long submit to such a state of things. But the intelligent among the negro population do not seem to consider that any migration in the United States will materially affect for the better the social and political *status* of the colored people.

The "People's Advocate," (Feb. 1, 1879,) a colored paper published at Washington, in an able editorial on the subject, says:

There has been a very respectable partial migration, and no perceptible change has come over the South in its ideas of negro citizenship. In 1869-70, 60,000 left Virginia and North Carolina for Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, and Arkansas. They left Georgia by the thousands for Arkansas, Mississippi, and Louisiana, and have gone from Eastern Virginia to New York and New England; but the feeling is nearly as bad to-day in Virginia and Georgia as it was years ago.

And they are now fleeing from Alabama, Mississippi, and Louisiana.

"'Tis but a poor relief they gain
Who change the place but keep the pain."

And it strikes us, viewing matters from this distant standpoint, that the feeling toward the negro will continue to be "bad" in the United States, if being "bad" means the non-recognition of his social and political equality with the white man. For the negro, pure and simple, there is no country but Africa, and in America his deeper instincts tell him so. He will never be understood, nor will he ever understand his European guide and teacher, as long as he remains in the countries of his exile. He is often misled by the overflowing and ceaseless generosity of white men into a belief that his benefactors are getting nearer to the idea of practical oneness and brotherhood with him. But among the phenomena in the relations of the white man to the negro in the house of bondage none has been more curious than this: that the white man, under a keen sense of the wrongs done to the negro, will work for him, will suffer for him, will fight for him, will even die for him, but he cannot get rid of a secret contempt for him.

* "The Three Despised Races," etc., p. 25.

Mr. James Parton, in his article on "Antipathy to the Negro,"* says :

When Miss Kemble came first to Boston, in 1832, she sat next to the late John Quincy Adams at dinner one day, and the conversation turned upon the tragedy of "Othello." Miss Kemble has since reported one of Mr. Adams' remarks on this subject : "Talking to me about Desdemona, he assured me, with a most serious expression of sincere disgust, that he considered all her misfortunes as a very just judgment upon her for having married a *nigger*." If this anecdote had not come to us on such respectable authority we could hardly believe it of a man who, during the last and best ten years of his life, was looked upon as the black man's champion.

Theodore Parker, who in pleading for the slave could "stir his hearers to the bottom of their hearts and soften them to tears;" who, in his famous letter to Millard Fillmore, (Nov. 21, 1850,) could say :

I would rather lie all my life in jail and starve there than refuse to protect one of these parishioners of mine. . . . William Craft and Ellen were parishioners of mine. They have been at my house. I married them a fortnight ago this day. After the ceremony I put a Bible and then a sword into William's hands, and told him the use of each. . . . There hang beside me in my library, as I write, the gun my grandfather fought with at the battle of Lexington—he was a captain on that occasion—and also the musket he captured from a British soldier on that day, the first taken in the war for independence. If I would not peril my property, my liberty, my life, to keep my parishioners out of slavery, then I would throw away these trophies, and should think I was the son of some coward, and not a brave man's child.†

Theodore Parker, who could say, "I should like of all things to see an insurrection of slaves;" ‡ who could pronounce that pathetic and touching but terrible discourse over the great Webster; this same Theodore Parker did not think it inconsistent with his high ideal of human liberty and equal rights to write in a private letter as follows :

Last night I could not coax the thermometer down below 79° any way we could fix it. Now, at eight and a half A. M., I dare not look at it, it is so high. In the midst of the heat there

* "North American Review," Nov.-Dec., 1878.

† "Biography of Theodore Parker." By Octavius Brooks Frothingham. Boston : James R. Osgood & Co. 1876. Pp. 410, 411.

‡ Ibid., p. 475.

just came a monstrous African black! O dear, how black he was! Fat! bless me, he looked like a barrel (no, a *sugar hogs-head*) of tar, so black, so fat! What an aggravation, with the thermometer at 90° in the shade!*

We should have taken this for the irrepressible overflow of harmless witticism but for other disparaging references to the negro. To Miss Hunt he writes, under date November 10, 1857:

There are inferior races which have always borne the same ignoble relation to the rest of men, and *always will*. For two generations what a change there will be in the condition and character of the Irish in New England! But in twenty generations the negroes will stand just where they are now; that is, if they have not disappeared. In Massachusetts there are no laws now to keep the black man from any pursuit, any office, that he will; but there has never been a rich negro in New England; not a man with ten thousand dollars, perhaps none with five thousand dollars; none eminent in any thing except the calling of a *waiter*.†

Again: "In respect to the *power of civilization*, the African is at the bottom, the American Indian next."‡ Again: "When slavery is abolished, the African population will decline in the United States, and die out of the South as out of Northampton and Lexington."§

Mr. Parker, after all he said and did for freedom, seems to have had an invincible contempt for weak and oppressed races. He waged uncompromising warfare against the process by which such peoples are degraded, but had no charity toward those suffering from the results of such process. He fought against the parent, and ridiculed the offspring. The abstract to him was hateful; the concrete examples contemptible or ludicrous. He scorned the Irish and laughed at the negro. He speaks of the Irish as follows:

I don't know but these Paddies are worse than the Africans to the country. We made a great mistake in attracting them here and allowing them to vote under less than twenty-one years of quarantine. Certainly it would take all that time to clean a Paddy—on the *outside* I mean; to clean him inwardly would be like picking up all the sands of the Sahara. There would be nothing left when the sands were gone. ||

* "Biography," p. 311.

† Ibid., p. 467.

‡ Ibid., p. 327.

§ Ibid., p. 473.

|| Ibid., p. 473.

It is a pity that in speaking of the "gentleman from Car-r-r-k," as in caricature he describes the Irishman, and of "the poor wretches from Africa," he did not conform to his own canon of criticism. Speaking of Pierpont, he says: "Just now, considering all that he has done and suffered, it would seem a little ungenerous to be quite just. All pictures must be painted in reference to the light they are to hang in and be looked at." *

Mr. Parker knew the "light" of prejudice and contempt in which his picture of the negro was to "hang," and yet, making no allowance for circumstances, and uninfluenced by the laws of moderation, he holds the balance between light and shade with an indifferent hand, paints in the gloomiest possible colors, and thus encourages rather than disarms the falsifying faculty of the observer predisposed to an unfavorable impression.

Would Mr. Parker have joined Dennis Kearney, and raised a crusade in favor of the inhospitable legislation proposed by the opponents of Chinese immigration? In view of the splendid results in the United States and in the world generally of the manly struggle which Mr. Parker maintained for truth and freedom—in view of the large sacrifices which he unquestionably made in the cause of free humanity—many errors of temper and judgment on his part may be forgotten; but the negro can never forget the slurs upon his race, of which, however, no one, perhaps, more readily than Mr. Parker would now admit the impolicy if not the injustice. For how do such utterances differ in character and effects from those of the Notts and Gliddons, of the Calhouns and Jeff. Davises? And the fact—which should be suggestive to thinking negroes in the United States—that they are reproduced in the biography by Mr. Frothingham, shows that there is a feeling that they are the proper thing to say, even now, about the negro. Can Congressional legislation remedy the evils produced by such caricatures and misrepresentations? Congress may decree civil rights to the "despised" race in America, and the exigencies of party may occasionally bring the negro to the front; but what progress can he make when a public sentiment against him is fostered in the writings and in the private intercourse of his

* "Biography," p. 329.

friends? In the language of the Liberian Declaration of Rights, "Public sentiment, more powerful than law, will ever frown him down."

The negro, pure and simple, may rely upon it that for him the most enthusiastic of his benefactors sees nothing but the lowest occupations. In the case of the most liberal of his advocates he will have occasionally to exclaim, *Et tu, Brute!*

A writer in the Methodist Quarterly Review for January, 1875, on "The Negro," has the following among the closing sentences of an able and plausible defense of the race:

Without the negro the top-stone of our national greatness will not be lifted to its predestined lofty altitude for centuries yet to come. Expatriate the negro, and our cotton-fields whiten no more; our turpentine orchards become silent as the grave; our rice-fields grow up into canebrakes, sheltering the alligator and wild boar.

But does the American conscience ever look forward to the time when, in the United States, the negro will have any common interest in, or any, the slightest possible, control over, the political and financial elements of the country—when he will be needed as a part of the directing agency in the halls of legislation, in counting-houses, and in banking establishments?

Mr. Parton, in the "North American Review," says:

The South is most happy in possessing the negro; for it is through his assistance that there will be the grand agriculture in the Southern States, which cannot flourish unless there is a class to labor and individuals to contrive. The Southern farmer, by the black man's help, can be a "scholar and a gentleman," and at the same time secure and elevate the black man's life.

Such utterances "give color to the idea" that the negro was made to live and improve only in the service and under the guidance of a superior. If this view is correct, then why does not the great Creator allow the elect masters to have free access and safe incursion into the natural home of the created slaves, and live in a land where they might hold their predestined *protégés* in unlimited numbers and in comfortable service? Why did He make for the slaves so magnificent a country, and surround it with a wall of fire, so that if the master comes to the threshold he either beats a hasty retreat or perishes in the attempt to penetrate?

"Massa run away,
Darkee stay, oh ho!"

No; the destiny of the negro and his marvelous country is veiled from the view of the outside world according to the wise and beneficent purposes of Omniscience.

"God is his own interpreter,
And he will make it plain."

He can wait, if the impatient Caucasian cannot.

The American Missionary Association, whose publications we have prefixed to this paper, in their work of lofty and noble purpose throughout the South are endeavoring to prepare the negro for higher spheres of labor than "cotton-fields, turpentine orchards, and rice-fields." Every negro who is at all acquainted with matters in the United States must have the highest admiration for that Association. Almost alone among the benevolent institutions of that land in the days of the great struggle, they never for one moment yielded to the imperious dictates of an oligarchical monopoly, but gave expression to the idea which they inscribed upon their banner, that one of the chief purposes of their organization was to resist the tyranny of the autocracy which doomed the negro to perpetual servitude. No one could be enrolled among the members of their society who was "a slave-holder." They have the gratitude of the negro race.

But history will have a brighter page than even that with which to adorn their annals when she comes to recount the devotion and sacrifices of the hundreds who have been sent forth under their auspices as uplifters of the prostrate host in the South, to whom, left as they were paralyzed by slavery, free movement and real progress were intrinsically impossible without the aid of such agencies as the American Missionary Association. As time rolls on the romance which clings to those heroes who fought to unfetter the body of the slave will fade beside the halo which will surround those who have labored to liberate his mind.

We have read with the deepest interest the report and some of the addresses made at the Thirty-second Anniversary of this Association, held in October, 1878, as well as letters from various portions of the field under its supervision. In reading the accounts of the struggles and sufferings of the missionaries, their sorrows and disappointments, their battles and their vic-

tories among the lowly in remote and sequestered districts, it is often impossible to repress the tears—tears of sympathy, of gratitude, and of joy.

At the Annual Meeting Rev. C. M. Southgate said :

We heard words of hearty praise this afternoon, telling of the success of the work. They tell hardly enough. But these efforts should be redoubled. We want more institutions like those at Atlanta, New Orleans, Charleston, and the other large Southern cities where high culture and intelligence rule. The scholarship can be compared without fear with similar grades at the North. I never heard in our boasted common schools such recitations as I have heard from boys as black as the blackest. I know what Yale and Harvard and Dartmouth can show ; but in Greek and Latin those colored students can rival their excellence. The culture in morals and manners is at least not inferior, nor the religious instruction less fruitful. The report from the Churches shows as large and as healthy success as we can show here. The young men and women in these institutions have an intense longing to be at work for the Master. The desperate condition of their race rests upon them like a pall. God is making them his prophets, and speaking through them, and sending redemption.

Rev. Dr. Bascom, in a letter from Alabama, says :

I see abundant proofs of the beneficent work of your Society here. Could its influence have been exerted in like manner among all our colored people of the South, the problem so perplexing to politicians and philanthropists, as to the future of this class in our country, would have been already solved.

The committee on the "Normal Work of the Association" reported that :

The eagerness of the colored people to obtain at least a rudimentary education has ever been a most encouraging sign. The young man who last year walked fifty miles with his trunk upon his back that he might enter school, recalls the zeal of the late Dr. Godell, of Constantinople, who, in his youth, also walked sixty miles with a trunk strapped upon his back, that he might enter Phillips Academy, at Andover. The demand for teachers from the normal schools—quite beyond the ability to supply them—is one of the surest indications that the schools are meeting an urgent need.

We regret that Professor Hartranft, in his able address on the "Five Tests of American Civilization," should have spoken of the "brutality of the negro." In what portion of the United States has that "brutality" been shown? Such a charge is in

flagrant contradiction to all the testimony borne of the negro by those who know him best.

And here we must venture to enter our earnest protest against the use of such phrases as "The Despised Races," which we see frequently used of late in the publications of the American Missionary Association. The Rev. Joseph Cook addressed the Association on the "Three Despised Races," and he was followed by Rev. C. M. Southgate on "Puritanism and the Despised Races." Such expressions as "The Despised Race" and "The Dark Continent," applied to the negro and his ancestral home, have not, we fancy, the most salutary effect either upon those who employ them or upon those to whom they refer; in the one they often beget arrogance; in the other, servility or resentment. They do more than serve the *ad captandum* purposes for which they are probably intended. In using "great plainness of speech" the instructors of humanity should be "wise as serpents and harmless as doves," which, according to a negro interpreter, means "an ounce of serpent to a pound of dove." Moreover, the whole of the rest of mankind does not hold the European, in view of his past history, in such unqualified admiration as to admit without serious question that he has a right to embody in terse phrases, and to parade in the titles of books, pamphlets, and addresses his contempt for other races. There are those of other races who also sneer and scorn and "despise." Some of the proceedings of Baker and Stanley in Africa must frequently have impressed the natives with the feeling that those energetic travelers came from much "darker continents" than any their unsophisticated imaginations had ever before suggested to them. The African now coming forward through education and culture cannot have unlimited respect for all the qualities of the European races: "A people with a passion for taking away the countries of others and dignifying the robbery as conquests; and whose systematic cruelty has been shown for ages in chaining, buying, and selling another race.

"Hearest thou, O God, those chains
Clanking on Freedom's plains,
By Christians wrought?
Those who those chains have worn
Christians have hither borne,
Christians have bought."

The intelligent negro feels that the part of the oppressor is not less to be despised than the part of the oppressed—that the part of the man-stealer and man-seller is far more contemptible than the part of the man stolen and sold. And this he will feel more and more. The brilliancy of the universal and prolonged success which has given the European the idea that he has a right to despise others and to proclaim the fact—the glories which have followed in the wake of his progress and conquests—are getting sadly dimmed in the light of a fuller understanding of the Gospel of Christ. Under the searching criticisms of rising intellects imbued with the essence of a Christian philosophy and influenced by the spirit of a science properly so called, those brutal instincts which received the eulogiums of the past are finding their proper recognition as elements of character to be reprobated and suppressed. The Bosworth Smiths of to-day are superseding the Carlyles of yesterday. Might no longer makes right. The motto on the British coat-of-arms is being slightly altered—not “God and *my* Right,” but “God and *the* Right.” Whatever “smacks of saltpeter”* is being deprecated and condemned. Says the eloquent author of “Carthage and the Carthaginians:”

It is equally reprehensible, whether it be the plunder of half of Europe by the representative of one of its most enlightened nations, the arch-robber of modern times, Napoleon, or the sack of a Chinese palace by those whom the Chinese had a right, in this instance at least, to style barbarians. If good men and great nations have hitherto often followed the example of Cicero in drawing a broad contrast between the extortions of a Verres and the high-handed plunder of Marcellus, a Warren Hastings, or a Napoleon, it is because they have not yet reached the moral standard which condemns the public robber; they look askance only at a thief. †

History, then, as it is read by the thinking negro, will not diminish the vehemence of his protest against the injustice of being regarded by the European as belonging to a “despised race,” nor lessen the grounds of his desire to reciprocate the

* Lord Salisbury's Speech in the House of Lords, 1879.

† “Carthage and the Carthaginians.” By R. Bosworth Smith, M.A., Assistant Master in Harrow School, etc. London: Longmans, Green, & Co. 1878. When Dr. Johnson expressed a hope that he might never hear of the Punic Wars again he never anticipated any thing like this brilliant and charming work—this startling investment in flesh and blood of the dry bones of Carthaginian history.

disparaging sentiment. His hands are free from the blood of other men. He has not in any way oppressed other races. He has suffered, *and that is all*. He has been scattered and peeled, despoiled and plundered, abused, persecuted, and down-trodden, *and that is all*. The late Professor Tayler Lewis, of Union College, when he was once asked the flippant question, "What shall we do with the negro?" replied, "And pray, sir, what shall the negro do with you? It is my logic, with no disrespect to anybody, that one question is as fair as the other."*

The negroes on the African continent who have not read European history are divided into two classes, namely, those who have seen and had intercourse with the Europeans, and those who have never seen but only heard of them. The view taken by the former at this moment is exactly that described by Mungo Park a hundred years ago. A century has made no change. Of the impressions of the latter we have a fair specimen in one of Stanley's amusing anecdotes. Mungo Park says:

Although the negroes in general have a very great idea of the wealth and power of the Europeans, I am afraid that the Mohammedan converts among them think very lightly of our superior attainments in religious knowledge. The white traders in the maritime districts take no pains to counteract this unhappy prejudice. The poor Africans, whom we affect to consider as barbarians, look upon us, I fear, as little better than a race of formidable but ignorant heathen.†

Mr. Stanley, describing the people on the south-western shores of Lake Tanganyika, says:

The conduct of the first natives to whom we were introduced pleased us all. They showed themselves in a very amiable light, sold their corn cheaply and without fuss, behaved themselves decently and with propriety, though their principal men, *entertaining very strange ideas of white men*, carefully concealed themselves from view, and refused to be tempted to expose themselves within view or hearing of us.

Their doubts of our character were reported to us by a friendly young Arab as follows: "Kassanga, chief of Ruanda, says, 'How can the white men be good when they come for no trade, whose feet one never sees, who always go covered from head to foot with clothes? Do not tell me they are good and friendly. There is something very mysterious about them; perhaps wicked. Probably they are magicians; at any rate, it is better to leave them alone, and to keep close until they are gone.'"

* Methodist Quarterly Review, Oct., 1878, p. 617.

† Park's Travels.

And again :

In these people we first saw the mild, amiable, unsophisticated innocence of this part of Central Africa, and their behavior was exactly the reverse of the wild, ferocious, cannibalistic races the Arabs had described to us.*

After the disparaging view of the negro taken by Professor Hartranft, it is not surprising that he should have exclaimed :

As to the African, there are not a few Americans, even in this day, who think a righteous solution of the African question is to ship them all off to the Dark Continent. So far as the American Colonization Society keeps in view education and other Christian instrumentalities I bid them God-speed ; but if they desire to send the negro out of the country, I say, No ! a thousand times, No ! Let us solve the problem right here where God has placed them.

We cannot help repeating the last words of the paragraph—"right here where *God has placed them*"—and we think of the sanguinary scenes attending the capture and deportation of their fathers from the ancestral land ; the devastation of flourishing districts ; the desolation and ruin by fire and sword ; the pillage, the plunder, the murders, and the horrors of the middle passage.

There was among philanthropists a difference of opinion when these people, or their fathers, were being shipped to America ; and Professor Hartranft is not alone in his benevolent scruples about shipping them back to the "Dark Continent."

The Rev. Sylvanus Heywood, who seems to have a higher appreciation of the race and of its work, speaks of the negro as the "black diamond plucked out of Africa," and advocates for him an education the same in character and completeness as that given to the white man. He says :

You may enact laws and hedge them about with penalties for securing the rights of the blacks, but law alone will prove a failure. But give to them the highest Christian culture, and they will not only demand, but command, their rights. Give them a common school education, and it will be a blessing to them ; but with nothing more they will remain but hewers of wood and drawers of water. They will be *in* society, but not *of* it. But give them the highest culture among cultured men, and the case will be far different. It is too late in the day to raise the ques-

* "Through the Dark Continent," vol. ii, pp. 68, 69.

tion whether they are capable of this. This Association has demonstrated that day by day. I have spent ten years as a teacher among the whites and two among the blacks, and I must say that I accomplished more in those two years than in ten—more in the way of giving instruction. I say it is too late to raise that question at all. It is already demonstrated. Let them be educated with broad culture. Let them have the training that will put them in possession of practical skill, such as shall win success. Let them have their own lawyers well trained in legal lore, so that they shall be able—in that natural eloquence in which they excel—to carry conviction to dignified courts. Let them have clergymen, not only earnest and sanctified, but able to cope with the deep things of science and theology—men able to stand before the most learned bodies. Let them have statesmen, well-grounded in philosophy, history, and government, so that they will be able not only to win victories upon the stump, but in the halls of legislation. Let their homes become homes of Christian culture and social refinement. Then, and not till then, will they cease to struggle for their rights, and *take* them.

But Mr. Heywood takes also a much broader view of the logical and necessary sequence of all this high culture—of all this effective training. He points to the fatherland. His philosophy is correct. For the negro, pure and simple, this is the only real solution of his difficulties. He says :

The ways of God are mysterious. We must walk by faith, and not by sight. We hear his voice saying, "This is the way; walk ye in it." In this darkness we see his hand. In the raising of this Society and the doing away with slavery we can see almost visibly the hand of God displayed upon the midnight sky, pointing to that Dark Continent, saying we should send these freemen forth as the apostles of light to purify and make glad their ancestral homes.

No man who has any proper conception of the capacities and work of the negro, and has caught any thing like a glimpse of his ultimate destiny, can fail to arrive at Mr. Heywood's conclusion. To the intelligent and earnest negro in America there is, as he rises in culture, an ever-widening horizon of duty and of liberty. Home, or rather the place of his birth, gets too narrow for liberty, too circumscribed for work, and he looks to Africa as the field for both.

In an able article in the London "Times" for May 19, on the negro migration in the United States, the following words occur :

The truth is that the negro is not a migratory being. He did not come of his own accord to Virginia or any other Southern

State, nor will he willingly leave it again now that he is acclimatized there. He has found an Africa in the South which is quite as congenial to him as that from which his forefathers were transported.

On the subject of the negro the "Times" and every body else not African are utterly in the dark. An acknowledged mystery hangs about him and his destiny. Foreigners do not know the negro. They have never had an opportunity of knowing him. Foreign slavery on the one hand, and aboriginal barbarism on the other, are the only circumstances under which they have had an opportunity of contemplating him. It is true that the "negro is not a migratory being." He would never have appeared on American soil if he had not been taken thither by violence. And the restlessness he now shows is among the strongest proofs of his freedom. He is now free to think and act for himself, and the consciousness of being a stranger in a strange land is beginning to operate upon him. The "Times" admits that "this is not the first symptom of a desire for change among the colored citizens;" and yet it fancies that the negro has found "an Africa in the South which is quite as congenial to him as that from which his forefathers were transported." The fact is, that the negro is getting every day more and more into a position to show himself no longer a dormant, but an active, factor among the forces of civilization, and the European will witness almost daily new developments in his character—the exhibition of qualities never suspected. Next to ridicule one of the most repulsive things to a sensitive mind is sympathy unduly extended, especially when the sympathizer has no means of correctly estimating the situation which he imagines should call forth his sympathy. There are very few Europeans who are qualified either to guide or to sympathize with the negro in the countries of his exile; and gratuitous advice even from these, in vital questions of his race, has no practical influence upon him.

"The enthusiasm for Liberia" has not died out, as the "Times" imagines. The American Colonization Society has at this moment five hundred thousand applicants for passage to Liberia. Dr. A. L. Stanford, a negro of culture, who was sent last year as Commissioner to Liberia from his people in Arkansas, returned with a favorable report, in which he says:

After traveling extensively in Liberia and observing the prosperous condition of the colony which the American Colonization Society has planted, and, I am convinced, firmly established, I am prepared to lend my aid in disabusing the public mind in regard to the noble efforts put forth by that Society in elevating the downtrodden negro race. I entertain very different views from what I held before. I verily believe that Africa is the natural home of the negro, and that ere long the remnant of her descendants, wherever dispersed, will return to that land. I favor a gradual emigration of the more enterprising, hard-working, and intelligent class of American negroes. I believe such a course would prove a blessing to Africa and to the race.*

It is admitted by all travelers to the coast that Liberia occupies five hundred miles of the finest and most picturesque portion of West Africa, with an interior extending two hundred miles on indefinitely back, abounding in every thing necessary for the growth and prosperity of a people. The whole valley of the Niger is accessible to this republic, teeming with a population every-where hospitable and friendly, ready and anxious to welcome to their salubrious, prolific, and picturesque home their brethren returning from the countries of their exile.

In the trade and commerce of this country there seems to be a special interest, not only for the negroes in the United States, but for the whole American people. There would be unlimited demand for American productions in that vast region now almost untouched. Gold, and hides, and beeswax, and rubber, as well as the finest coffee, might be had in unlimited quantities. Not far from Liberia are the unvisited but easily accessible and wealthy countries north and west of Ashantee and Dahomey, possessing the very highest capacity for the consumption of manufactured articles and for the production of raw material—from which a prodigious trade, struggling for an outlet, filters through in very small quantities to the Gulf of Benin.

Viewing the subject in this light, it becomes a practical business question whether there are no large capitalists in the Northern or Southern States willing to invest in an entirely virgin country, so much nearer to the United States than many of those countries from which at great expense tropical productions are now obtained for the American market—a field where

* "African Repository," April, 1879, pp. 40, 41.

agriculture may find unobstructed scope; where so many results, moral, political, and pecuniary, may be at once achieved; and where a Christian nation, with its multifarious agencies for diffusing civilization, may be built up. If American capitalists desired to engage in agriculture, and to produce the far-famed Liberia coffee or any other tropical product, they could themselves select and send out able hands from America for this work, who, while building up a congenial home for themselves and their children, and making "the wilderness and solitary place glad" for their presence, would be also enlarging the wealth of their patrons.

At a banquet given in Paris on the 19th of May, 1879, in commemoration of the abolition of slavery, M. Victor Hugo said: "In the nineteenth century the white man has made the negro a man, and in the twentieth century Europe will make Africa a world."

We admire the epigrammatic form of this sentence, but we venture to disagree with the sentiment it contains. As philosopher and prophet, the great poet is in this instance mistaken. Poetical inspirations do not always suggest sound political lessons. But what he said further on in his speech should be carefully pondered by all intelligent negroes every-where. He said:

The day had come for the vast continent which alone among the five parts of the world had no history to be reformed by Europeans. The Mediterranean was a lake of civilization, and it was the duty of Greece and of Italy, of France and of Spain, the four countries that occupied its northern shores, to recollect that a vast territory lay unredeemed on the opposite coast. England was also worthy to take part in the great work. She, like France, was one of the great free nations of the globe, and, like France, she had begun the colonization and civilization of Africa. The latter held the north and east, the former the south and the west. America had joined in the task, and Italy was ready to do so. This showed the unity of spirit which pervaded the peoples of the world. M. Victor Hugo then described the magnificent scenery, the fertility, and the navigable rivers of Central Africa in eloquent language, and concluded by exhorting the European nations to occupy this land offered to them by God, to build towns, to make roads, to cultivate the earth, to introduce trade and commerce, to preach peace and concord, so that the new continent should not be the scene of strife, but, free from princes and priests, should enjoy the blessings of fraternity.*

* "Daily Telegraph," May 20.

It is really high time that a "unity of spirit should pervade the peoples of the world" for the regeneration of a continent so long despoiled by the unity or consent of these same peoples. Thinking negroes should ask themselves what part they will take in this magnificent work, the work of reclaiming a continent—*their own continent*. In what way will they illustrate their participation in the "unity of spirit" which pervades the peoples for the redemption of their fatherland? Compared to this, most of the questions with which they are endeavoring to grapple in the United States sink into insignificance. The local can bear no comparison to the universal, nor the temporary to the eternal.

Victor Hugo exhorts the European nations to "occupy this land offered to them by God." He has forgotten the prudent advice of Caesar to the ancestors of those nations against invading Africa. The Europeans can hold the domain "offered to them" by only a precarious tenure. But it already belongs to the exiled negro. It is his by creation and inheritance. Every man, woman, and child of the negro race out of Africa ought to thank God for this glorious heritage, and hasten to possess it: a field for the physical, moral, and spiritual development of the negro, where he will live under the influence of his freshest inspirations; where, with the simple shield of faith in God and in his race, and with the sword of the spirit of progress, he will grow and thrive; where, with his sympathetic heart, he will catch stray, far-off tones, inaudible to the foreigner, which, penetrating through the local air, will waken chords in his nature now unknown to the world and unsuspected even by himself. He will come under the influence of powers which will haunt him with strange visions and indicate the way he should go. Emerson says:

A man's genius, the quality that differences him from every other, the susceptibility to one class of influences, the selection of what is fit for him, the rejection of what is unfit, determines for him the character of the universe. A man is a method, a progressive arrangement; a selecting principle, gathering his like to him wherever he goes. He takes only his own out of the multiplicity that sweeps and circles round him. He is like one of those booms which are set out from the shore on rivers to catch drift-wood, or like the loadstone among splinters of steel. . . . A few anecdotes, a few traits of character, manners, face,

a few incidents, have an emphasis in your memory out of all proportion to their apparent significance, if you measure them by the ordinary standards. They relate to your gift. Let them have their weight, and do not reject them and cast about for illustration and facts more useful to literature. What your heart thinks great is great. The soul's emphasis is always right.*

When Professor Hartranft says, "Let us solve the negro problem right here," in America, what "problem" does he refer to? And how does he propose to solve the great questions of the African race in the United States? There are certain problems at times set before a people by accidental and temporary circumstances; these may admit of solution by extraneous help. There are others which grow out of their natural, inherent, and unchangeable relation to the outside world or the universe; these are to be solved by the people themselves under favoring circumstances; the trusts and responsibilities which these impose are special, incommunicable, and inalienable. But probably Professor Hartranft means the problem pressing upon the white man in his relations to the negro; the problem of his duty toward the "despised" race—his power to arrive at a satisfactory solution being a "test" of his civilization. In regard to this, of course, we can suggest nothing. But from all we can gather it appears that the chief problem held up to the negro for *his* solution by his friends in America is that of "conquering the caste prejudices of the whites" around him; of becoming, as the usual phrase is, "a man among men," (white men;) of "wiping out the color line," etc. Now, we beg most respectfully, with all the earnestness and deference becoming the subject, and with the serious emphasis which we know the enlightened of the race would authorize us to employ, to assure our white friends that these are matters for which the negro, pure and simple, when cultivated up to Mr. Heywood's standard, will care very little. He will then feel that in his own race-groove and on his own continent he has a work to accomplish equal to that of the European, and that caste or race prejudices are as natural to him as to the white man. The passion for equality does not always exert an elevating influence on the character, but may be positively mischievous, where to produce or sustain it certain sentiments in the mind are flat-

* The Prose Works of Ralph Waldo Emerson, vol. i, p. 292.

tened by holding the higher attributes in abeyance, or brought into prominence at the expense of judgment and love of truth.

Ripe scholarship and disciplined thought, even under the training he is receiving in America, will give to the negro a freshness, a manliness, a hopefulness, and a faith which will deliver him from the tyranny of his surroundings, widen his view of his own capabilities, make him conscious of belonging to a race which has rich things in store for the world, and glorify his heart with a thousand strange and fruitful sympathies and with endless heroic aspirations.

The negro who is really restless on the subject of caste in America is he who, from defective culture or lack of culture, has not half found out the calling of his race; who, consequently, unduly impressed by his surroundings, is eager for immediate success, and anxious to play his part well amid the circumstances in which he finds himself—aiming at technical skill, which is popular or fashionable, rather than artistic life, which may be unique and unpopular. Fascinated by the present, he cannot conceive any thing else, and harasses himself with the ever-recurring and ever-unsatisfying and unsatisfactory task of imitating imitators. The negro raised to Mr. Heywood's standard will feel the force of Emerson's words:

We like only such actions as have already long had the praise of men, and do not perceive that any thing man can do may be divinely done. We think greatness entailed or organized in some places, or duties in certain offices or occasions, and do not see that Paganini can extract rapture from a catgut, and Eulenstein from a jew's-harp, and a limber-fingered lad out of shreds of paper with his scissiors, and Landseer out of swine, and the hero out of the pitiful habitation and company in which he was hidden. What we call obscure condition or vulgar society is that condition and society whose poetry is not yet written, but which you shall presently make as enviable and renowned as any.*

Recognizing the force of these truths, the cultivated negro will have insight enough to discover his exact relation to surrounding superficial phenomena, and self-respect and independence enough to acknowledge the fact that his peculiar work cannot be done under the overshadowing influence of a foreign race; that there he cannot "communicate himself to others in his full stature and proportion;" and, feeling this, he will turn

* "Prose Works," vol. ii, p. 291.

to the fatherland, to "the one direction in which all space is open to him," and under the conviction that "he has faculties inviting him thither to endless exertion."

The teachers of the negro in America cannot have failed to observe that there seems always to be in the minds of their pupil some reservation which they cannot overcome, some hesitancy which they cannot explain, but which they attribute to a sort of modesty growing out of a sense of inferiority in the pupil. But the fact is, that, under the influence of the means of culture to which he has access, his race-consciousness is kindled into active and sensitive life, and he receives under mental protest many a dogma which for European growth and development is orthodox and inspiring. Not only the physical and metaphysical teachings often puzzle and contradict his deepest feelings, but even the Scriptures are at times a perplexity to him; and as he becomes acquainted with the original languages in which they were written, he feels that there is in them a temporary and local element which must be separated from the permanent and universal before the sacred records can utter what in the depths of his being he wants to say. But in America he will never be able to make the discrimination that will be useful to him. He will never be able to translate the letter, which is often adapted to another age and race, into the spirit of his own times and race. He is, therefore, lonely with his secret, with which nothing around him seems to sympathize. Development is denied him; he cannot expand. He fills his belly with theories and dogmas which to him are like the dry, hard husk. He cannot digest them, and they afford him no nourishment. Nearly every thing he produces comes from the memory; very little flows fresh from the heart. The African Methodist Episcopal Church in the United States is the result, in part, of just such experiences on the part of the Bishop Allens of a former day. They found that the waters flowing from the fountain which God had opened in their soul were slackened and half-choked by being forced through the pent-up and artificial channels provided for them in the white Churches, and they established that noble organization—the admiration of negroes every-where, which during the last fifty years has attained such wonderful growth—that the living streams of their unfettered nature might wind their own sweet way along the

meadows of an ecclesiastical Liberia. If the fare with which they were furnished in the new religious republic was ridiculed by their enemies as "ash cake," it was to them more than the wheat bread upon which they were starved in their previous connection. The food now dispensed to them was to their souls the very bread of life.

But there are many drawbacks to this *imperium in imperio*. It grew out of a temporary and local necessity, and, like all such products, must be partial and limited in its influence. Does it not become this most honorable and useful body—this first-born of African Churches—this pledge and proof of Africa's future evangelization—to inquire whether they may not increase their efficiency and even develop their central strength by taking a wider, deeper, and more practical interest in the land of their fathers, in their kith and kin in Africa? Their system is capable of indefinite development in the vast and unoccupied field which this continent presents. The message to them, as a Church of Christ, is, "Go ye into all the world;"—not only over the United States, from California to New York and from New England to Texas, but to "regions beyond," especially to the lost sheep of their own race. Their talents, it occurs to us, are not as useful and as profitable as they might be made. This is a drawback and a mistake. If it be sinful to wrap our talent in a napkin and hide it in the earth, it is only one degree less sinful so to handle it as to make it yield twofold only where it might yield ten. We are persuaded, however, that it is not the courage they lack for the work, but conviction. The same self-control and self-reliance, the same energy and independence, which led to the founding of the African Churches in the United States would readily, if there were earnest conviction on the subject, sacrifice the charms of home, the comforts of civilization, the æsthetic and sensuous attractions of an enlightened country, for the labors and toils and privations of the wilderness. They are quite equal to, and have shown themselves worthy of, the great achievement of taking possession of the whole valley of the Niger for Christ. Let them arise and come, and they will find in the home of their widowed parent that "the barrel of meal will not waste, nor will the cruse of oil fail." Freedom from restraint ought not to be our ultimate and final object, but FREEDOM TO WOR-

SHIP GOD: and the desire for such freedom is, in certain aspects of the subject, among the happiest of the popular instincts of the negro race.

It is remarkable that the message which Moses was commanded to bear to the tyrant Pharaoh was not "Let my people go that they may be *free*," but "Let my people go that they may *serve Me*." As long as they remained in a strange country under a foreign race they could not render that service for which they were fitted, and which God requires of every man. They could not serve the Lord with their "whole heart," the undiminished fullness of their nature, in carrying out the purposes of their being. "How could they sing the Lord's song in a strange land?" Their race impulses and instincts were hampered, confused, and impaired. So with the negro in America. Although their gatherings, of whatever nature, are usually marked and enlivened by a stream of religious feeling which continually flows with a rapid and sometimes boisterous current, still they cannot fully know God in that land, for they see him through the medium of others. Here and there there may be a "Caleb, who has another spirit within him, and follows the Lord fully;" but the masses are distracted by the disturbing *media*. The body, soul, and spirit do not work in harmony. The religious passions are predominant in their influence among them, and they show a co-operative and successful energy in ecclesiastical organizations; but in their political struggles there is no attempt at any logical or reasoned solution of their difficulties. "The negro," says Rev. Joseph Cook, "has gone to the wall in Mississippi, in spite of having a majority there and the suffrage. And he is likely to go to the wall in South Carolina. He is going to the wall even where he has a majority; and his inferiority in politics results from his lack of education"—such an education as he can never receive in America. But let him be delivered from the restraints of his exile; let him be set free from the stocks that now confine him, and he will not only arise and walk, but he will point out the way to his eminent success, which, in his particular line, only *he* can find out, and which he *must* find out for himself. He will discover the central point from which the lines may be easily and infallibly drawn to all the points of the circle in which he is to move effectively in the true work of his race for his own elevation and

the advantage of the rest of mankind. He will prove that what in African history and character seems nebulous confusion is really a firmament of stars. There are stars, astronomers tell us, whose light has not yet reached the earth; so there are stars in the moral universe yet to be disclosed by the unfettered African, which he must discover before he will be able to progress without wandering into perilous seas and suffering serious injury. Let him, then, return to the land of his fathers, and ACQUAINT HIMSELF WITH GOD, AND BE AT PEACE.

ART. VI.—THE GREAT EPIC OF INDIA.

The Ramayan of Valmiki Translated into English Verse. By RALPH T. H. GRIFFITH, M.A., Principal of the Benares College. Five vols. London: Trubner & Co. Benares: E. J. Lazarus & Co. 1870-1874.

The Ramayan of Tulsi Das. Translated by F. S. Growse, M.A., B. C. S. Book I, CHILDHOOD. Allahabad: North-western Provinces Government Press. 1877.

IN an article on "Dante" in a former number of this Review, the author wrote: "We count but four as having in the course of literature risen to the first class of epic poets—Homer, Virgil, Dante, and Milton* . . . The 'Iliad,' the 'Æneid,' the 'Vision,' and 'Paradise Lost' exhaust our catalogue."† To these must be added the illustrious name of Valmiki, and in this catalogue a place not the lowest must be given to the "Ramayan."

The hero of this poem is Rama or Ram Chandra, the seventh incarnation of Vishnu, (the *Preserver* in the Hindu Triad;) and, although he was born as other men are, and sinned as other men do, still he was a wonderful personage; as the Hindus recount, "virtuous, heroic, firm, true, grateful, good, kind, bounteous, and holy, just, and wise," comparable with "Sun, Moon, Indra, Vishnu, Fire, and Air." Of the ten incarnations of Vishnu Ram Chandra is by far the most popular, and the hold he has upon the hearts of this hero-loving nation can hardly be over-estimated. In every part of the country "Ram-Ram!" is a common term of salutation; by river's bank and under the *peepul's* shade devotees sit days at a time repeating, from dawn till dark, "Ram-Ram! Ram-Ram!" The *Janam*

* Methodist Quarterly Review, January, 1852, p. 50.

† Ibid., p. 51.

Asthan, or place of his birth at Ajudhiya, is daily visited by hosts of pilgrims, (as are the other places scattered here and there over India made famous by some connection with the great hero;) and when, but the other day, the native troops were leaving the Bombay harbor for Malta, the enthusiastic cheers which arose from the dark-hued soldiers were not "Long live the Queen!" "Three cheers for the Empress!" (Kaizar i Hind,) but "Ram Rajah Ki Jai!" "Ram Chandra Ki Jai!" (Hurrah for King Ram Chandra—Victory to Ram!)

The truly surprising popularity of the poem and its hero is also seen in the "Ram Lila," (Ram's Festival,) held annually at the close of September or early in October. This festival is observed throughout the country, and continues for a fortnight. During these happy days the chief parts of the "Ramayan" are acted, and the principal adventures of Ram are brought to the notice of the Hindu public. It is an open-air theater, attended day after day by enthusiastic millions. In the larger cities, like Lucknow, Cawnpore, and Benares, great preparations are made, large sums of money expended, and a corresponding amount of enthusiasm enkindled. It is not unusual for a wealthy Hindu to spend thousands of dollars upon a single entertainment of this kind. A large garden or other walled inclosure is selected; in this tents are pitched to represent the hostile camps of Ram and Ravan. Trees are set out; rivers are made; in short, the place becomes a miniature Hindustan from Ajudhiya to Ceylon. The actors who are hired for the occasion are dressed to represent the various characters of the poem, including even the monkeys. The play begins with the childhood of Ram, and progresses day after day until the climax is reached in the slaying Ravan and burning his city by the hero. It is pantomimic, and a loud-voiced pundit marches up and down in front of the spectators, keeping them acquainted with the progress of the play. Thousands of people, men, women, and children, all dressed as well and brightly as possible, laughing and chatting in the happiest manner, climb the garden walls, look down from the tops of surrounding houses, crowd the verandas of adjacent buildings, or stand in deep ranks around the extensive stage. The scene, with its indescribable *éclat*, is most interesting to look upon, and dwells long and pleasantly in one's memory. In smaller cities the

representation is on a more limited scale ; but every-where, in city, town, and hamlet, Ram's Festival is celebrated—as it has been for at least more than a score of centuries.

The subject of the "Ramayan" is, as the name implies, the life and adventures of Ram.* In this respect it is a true epic, and well planned. Various conjectures have been made as to the date of the events (real or imaginary) related in the poem. Sir William Jones places Ram Chandra in the year 2029 B. C., Tod in 1100, Bentley in 950, Gorresio in the 13th century B. C. The last named scholar, in the introduction to his edition of the "Ramayan," adduces a number of arguments in favor of the great antiquity of the poem, but these are hardly of convincing power. Perhaps a more proper estimate is the following, found in the fiftieth volume of the "Westminster Review :"

We are ignorant of the date of the poem, or rather of the era to which its older parts belong. Probably Valmiki and Homer were contemporaries ; perhaps the Hindu was the earlier of the two, and sang his song while that Ilion was a reality which to Homer rose in the background of two or three generations. Our limits forbid us to enter into any detailed proof, nor, indeed, could any be quite satisfactory. The best arguments for its age are found in the poem itself, and the habits and manners which it describes. Thus, the burning of widows on the funeral piles of their husbands, which the Greeks describe as an old custom when Alexander invaded India, B. C. 327, is utterly unknown in the "Ramayana," and one fact like this speaks volumes. In such poems as the "Ramayana" and the "Iliad" we instinctively feel that they belong to the earlier world ; we enter them as we enter a house in Pompeii—the colors may still seem fresh and no mark of decay remind us of their age, but we feel that they belong not to us or ours, and a gulf of ages lies between us and our objects.

The poem appears to have undergone two distinct revisions, one in Benares and the other in Bengal ; the former, as is generally allowed by European scholars, is the more genuine. The Bengal recension has been translated into Italian (by Gorresio) and into French, (by M. Fauche ;) but, until the appearance of the volumes before us, there had been no English version of either recension. In the years 1805–10 Carey and Marshman, the illustrious missionaries of Serampore, published the text and English translation of two books and a half, (the poem consists

* From *Rama and ayana.*

of seven books, containing twenty-four thousand verses,) but these volumes have long been out of print, and are said to be "very inferior as productions of literary art, though no blame attaches to the excellent men who published their work in the very dawn of Oriental studies."

In 1846 Schlegel published the text of the first two books, with a Latin translation of the first and part of the second. "I congratulate myself," he says in the Preface, "that by the favor of the Supreme Deity I have been allowed to begin so great a work. I glory and make my boast that I, too, after so many ages, have helped to confirm that ancient oracle declared to Valmiki by the father of gods and men :

"*Dum stabunt montes, campis dum flumina current,
Usque tuum toto carmen celebrabitur orbe.*"

The volumes before us indicate no small amount of research, scholarly ability, taste, and poetical skill. Mr. Griffith is to be congratulated for having given this very remarkable poem to the English public in so attractive a form. It will remain a worthy monument to his perseverance and erudition.

The work opens with a happy description of the great hero, his fair, strong body, and his many good qualities of head and heart. It also gives a brief history of his life, travels, and courageous deeds, which may be epitomized as follows :

Rama was the son of Dasaratha, King of Ajudhiya, who was fifty-seventh in descent from the illustrious Manu. This famous king had three queens, and the chief of these, Kausalya, gave birth to the hero of the poem. Even while a youth he became a general favorite in the kingdom, and especially with his father. In company with Lakshman, his ever-constant brother, he set out upon his travels. Journeying to the east, he arrived at the court of Janak, a great king, who gave him welcome in his own and in his father's name. This Janak had a bow wonderfully strong, and a daughter (named Sita) marvelously fair. He had promised Sita to the suitor who should be able to bend the great bow, but although many came to make the trial all failed. Rama asked to see the bow, and when it was brought seized it in the middle and drew the string until the weapon broke in two. The lovely Sita was at once pronounced to be his, and word was sent to his royal father, who hastened to attend the nuptial ceremonies. The marriage

was celebrated with great *éclat*, King Dasaratha giving as dowry one hundred thousand cows for each of his sons. The ceremonies ended, the kingly party returned to Ajudhiya, where they were met by an enthusiastic host of "people and Brahmans," who welcomed them home. The hero of the bow became more and more popular on account of his filial obedience, courage, and beauty.

"So for his virtues, kind and true,
Dearer and dearer Rama grew
To Dasaratha, Brahmans, all
In town and country, great and small."

The king grew older, and was minded to associate with himself his favorite son as Regent Heir. A popular assembly was held, and the people were asked to express their pleasure. The plan of the king was unanimously approved, and Rama was told by his father that he should be installed on the morrow. Great preparations were made. Temples, trees, shops, and houses were covered with banners and decorated with flowers; villagers came from every side and filled the city:

"Each with his friend had much to say
Of Rama's consecration day;
Yea, even children as they played
At cottage doors beneath the shade."

But, suddenly and without warning, the star of Rama's prosperity shot downward, and

"When Kaikeyi, youngest queen,
With eyes of envious hate had seen
The solemn pomp and regal state
Prepared the prince to consecrate,
She bade the hapless king bestow
Two gifts he promised long ago,
That Rama to the woods should flee,
And that her child the heir should be."

The king could not but keep his promise, and, weeping, banished his darling son, and in his place placed Kaikeyi's child, Bharat, upon the throne.

"Then Lakshman's truth was nobly shown,
Then were his love and courage known,
When for his brother's sake he dared
All perils, and his exile shared."

The faithful Sita, too, went with her lord. The king and people, "sad of mood," followed the departing hero until they came to the Ganges, when he crossed over and they returned to the capital. The little party went from wood to wood until

"They came to Chitrakuta's hill,
And Rama there, with Lakshman's aid,
A pleasant little cottage made,
And spent his days with Sita, dressed
In coat of bark and deer-skin vest.*
And Chitrakuta grew to be
As bright with those illustrious three †
As Meru's sacred peaks that shine
With glory, when the gods recline
Beneath them : Siva's self between
The Lord of Gold and Beauty's Queen."

The aged king pined for Rama, and died of grief. Bharat refused to reign, and wandered through the woods until he found his exiled brother. He besought him to return and take the throne, but Rama steadily refused, choosing rather to obey his father's decree :

"He placed his sandals in his hand,
A pledge that he would rule the land ;
And bade his brother turn again.

"Then Bharat, finding prayer was vain,
The sandals took and went away ;
Nor in Ayodhya would he stay,
But turned to Nandigrama, where
He ruled the realm with watchful care,
Still longing eagerly to learn
Tidings of Rama's safe return.

"Then lest the people should repeat
Their visit to his calm retreat,
Away from Chitrakuta's hill
Fared Rama ever onward, till
Beneath the shady trees he stood
Of Dandaká's primeval wood."

Here the hero of the poem took up his abode. Counseled by a new-found friend—

* The garb prescribed for ascetics by Manu.

† In half the temples of Oudh and Central India images of Rama, Lakshman, and Sita, made of marble and richly painted, are to be seen. The extent to which they are worshiped proves the estimation in which they are held.

"He gained the sword
And bow of Indra, heavenly lord :
A pair of quivers too, that bore
Of arrows an exhaustless store."

With these weapons he delivered the trembling hermits from their foes, destroying fiends, giants, and giantesses in countless numbers. The news was carried to Ravan, king of the demons,

"Whose name of fear
Earth, hell, and heaven all shook to hear."

"Impelled by fate and blind with rage,
He came to Rama's hermitage."

"He wiled the princely youths apart,
The vulture * slew and bore away
The wife of Rama as his prey."

Rama returned to his leafy cot, but, not finding Sita, he rushed through the forest broken-hearted, weeping and wailing over his loss. At last he made friends with Hanuman, "the wind-god's son," and Sugriva, a powerful chief. Hanuman went in quest of Sita. One "wild, tremendous leap" of two hundred leagues brought him to the capital city of Ceylon,

"Where Ravan held his royal sway,
There pensive 'neath Asoka boughs
He found poor Sita, Rama's spouse.
He gave the hapless girl a ring,
A token from her lord and king.
A pledge from her fair hand he bore ;
Then battered down the garden-door.
Five captains of the host he slew,
Seven sons of councillors o'erthrew ;
Crushed youthful Aksha on the field,
Then to his captors chose to yield."

Escaping,

"The town he burned with hostile flame,
And spoke again with Rama's dame,
Then swiftly back to Rama flew
With tidings of the interview."

Rama, accompanied by Hanuman, Sugriva, and legions of monkeys, set out to rescue the captive lady. A bridge was thrown across the narrow sea between the continent and Ceylon, and the host crossed—

* Jatayu, a semi-divine bird who fought in defense of Sita.

Then

"To Lanka's golden town,
Where Rama's hand smote Ravan down." *

"To meet her husband Sita came ;
But Rama, stung with ire and shame,
With bitter words his wife addressed
Before the crowd that round her pressed.
But Sita, touched with noble ire,
Gave her fair body to the fire.
Then straight the god of Wind appeared,
And words from heaven her honor cleared.
And Rama clasped his wife again,
Uninjured, pure from spot and stain."

Raising to life his fallen warriors, in company with Sita,
Rama flew in magic chariot through the clouds to Nandigrama :

"Met by his faithful brothers there,
He loosed his votive coil of hair ;
Thence fair Ayodhya's town he gained,
And o'er his father's kingdom reigned."

His reign was very prosperous :

"Disease or famine ne'er oppressed
His happy people, richly blest
With all the joys of ample wealth,
Of sweet content and perfect health.
No widow mourned her well-loved mate,
No sire his son's untimely fate.
They feared not storm or robber's hand ;
No fire or flood laid waste the land ;
The Golden Age † seemed come again
To bless the days of Rama's reign."

With this introduction, which fills four cantos, and which, evidently, is the work of a later hand than Valmiki's, the poem properly begins. First comes a beautiful description of Ayodhya, the capital city of the old kingdom : ‡

"On Sarju's bank, of ample size,
The happy realm of Kosal lies,

* The rocks lying between Ceylon and the mainland are still called Rama's Bridge by the Hindus.

† The Brahmans count four ages, the Krita, (age of the gods, the perfect or golden age,) the Treta, (the age of the three sacred fires,) the Dwapara, (the age of doubt,) and the Kali, (the present time, the age of evil.)

‡ Now called Ajudhiya, an interesting mass of ruins, adjoining the city of Fyzabad, eighty miles from Lucknow. The site is a grand one, and it is not at all difficult to imagine just such a city as the poet sings of formerly existing here.

With fertile length of fair champaign,
 And flocks and herds and wealth of grain.
 There, famous in her old renown,
 Ayodhya stands, the royal town
 In bygone ages built and planned
 By sainted Manu's princely hand.
 Imperial seat ! her walls extend
 Twelve measured leagues from end to end,
 And three in width from side to side,
 With square and palace beautified.
 Her gates at even distance stand ;
 Her ample roads are wisely planned.
 Right glorious is her royal street,
 Where streams allay the dust and heat.
 On level ground in even row
 Her houses rise in goodly show :
 Terrace and palace, arch and gate,
 The queenly city decorate.
 High are her ramparts, strong and vast,
 By ways at even distance passed,
 With circling moat, both deep and wide,
 And store of weapons fortified."—*Book I, Canto v.*

King Dasaratha and his people are next described :

"And worthy of so fair a place
 There dwelt a just and happy race
 With troops of children blest.
 Each man contented sought no more,
 Nor longed with envy for the store
 By richer friends possessed.
 For poverty was there unknown,
 And each man counted as his own
 Kine, steeds, and gold and grain.
 All dressed in raiment bright and clean,
 And every townsman might be seen
 With ear-rings, wreath, or chain.
 "Thus, worthy of the name she bore,*
 Ayodhya for a league or more
 Cast a bright glory round,
 Where Dasaratha, wise and great,
 Governed his fair ancestral State,
 With every virtue crowned.
 Like Indra in the skies, he reigned
 In that good town whose wall contained
 High domes and turrets proud,
 With gates and arcs of triumph decked,
 And sturdy barriers to protect
 Her gay and countless crowd."—*Book I, Canto vi.*

* Ayodhya means *Not to be fought against*.

There are many fine passages in the poem, but want of space forbids extensive quotations. We may, however, make a few :

THE BREAKING OF THE BOW.

"Then spoke again the great recluse :
 'This mighty bow, O king, produce.'
 King Janak, at the saint's request,
 This order to his train addressed :
 'Let the great bow be hither borne,
 Which flowery wreaths and scents adorn.'
 Soon as the monarch's words were said,
 His servants to the city sped :
 Five thousand youths in number, all
 Of manly strength and stature tall,
 The ponderous eight-wheeled chest that held
 The heavenly bow with toil propelled.
 At length they brought that iron chest,
 And thus the god-like king addressed :
 'This best of bows, O lord, we bring,
 Respected by each chief and king,
 And place it for these youths to see,
 If, sovereign, such thy pleasure be.'
 With suppliant palm to palm applied,
 King Janak to the strangers cried :
 'This gem of bows, O Brahman sage,
 Our race has prized from age to age,
 Too strong for those who yet have reigned,
 Though great in might each nerve they strained.
 Titan and fiend its strength defies,
 God, spirit, minstrel of the skies.
 And bard above and snake below
 Are baffled by this glorious bow.
 Then how may human prowess hope
 With such a bow as this to cope ?
 What man with valor's choicest gift
 This bow can draw, or string, or lift ?
 Yet let the princes, holy seer,
 Behold it : it is present here.'"

"Then spake the hermit pious-souled :
 'Rama, dear son, the bow behold.'
 Then Rama at his word unclosed
 The chest wherein its might reposed,
 Thus crying as he viewed it : 'Lo !
 I lay mine hand upon the bow :
 May happy luck my hope attend
 Its heavenly strength to lift or bend.'
 'Good luck be thine !' the hermit cried ;
 'Assay the task,' the king replied.

Then Raghu's son, as if in sport,
 Before the thousands of the court,
 The weapon by the middle raised,
 That all the crowd in wonder gazed.
 With steady arm the string he drew
 Till burst the mighty bow in two.
 As snapped the bow, an awful clang,
 Loud as the shriek of tempests, rang.
 The earth, affrighted, shook amain
 As when a hill is rent in twain.
 Then, senseless at the fearful sound,
 The people fell upon the ground ;
 None save the king, the princely pair,
 And the great saint the shock could bear.

"When woke to sense the stricken train,
 And Janak's soul was calm again,
 With suppliant hands and reverent head,
 These words, most eloquent, he said :
 'O saint, Prince Rama stands alone ;
 His peerless might he well has shown.
 A marvel has the hero wrought
 Beyond belief, surpassing thought.
 My child, to royal Rama wed,
 New glory on our line will shed ;
 And true my promise will remain
 That hero's worth the bride should gain.
 Dearer to me than light and life,
 My Sita shall be Rama's wife.'"—Book I, *Canto lxxvii.*

The triumph of the jealous Queen Kaikeyi over Dasaratha
 is thus described :

"When thus the archer king was bound
 With treacherous arts and oaths enwound,
 She to her bounteous lord, subdued
 By blinding love, her speech renewed :
 'Remember, king, that long past day
 Of gods and demons' battle fray,
 And how thy foe in doubtful strife
 Had nigh bereft thee of thy life.
 Remember it was only I
 Preserved thee when about to die,
 And thou for watchful love and care
 Wouldst grant my first and second prayer.
 Those offered boons, pledged with thee then,
 I now demand, O king of men,
 Of thee, O monarch, good and just,
 Whose righteous soul observes each trust.
 If thou refuse thy promise sworn,
 I die despised, before the morn.

These rites in Rama's name begun—
 Transfer them, and enthrone my son.
 The time is come to claim at last
 That double boon of days long-past,
 When gods and demons met in fight,
 And thou wouldst fain my care requite.
 Now forth to Dandak's forest drive
 Thy Rama for nine years and five,
 And let him dwell a hermit there
 With deer-skin coat and matted hair.
 Without a rival let my boy
 The empire of the land enjoy,
 And let mine eyes ere morning see
 Thy Rama to the forest flee."—*Book II, Canto xi.*

The poet draws a pleasing picture of the three exiles going through the forest farther and farther from their Ayodhya home, and seeking in their mutual love a higher pleasure than the courtly attractions from which they were banished could yield:

"The tender dame
 Asked Rama, as they walked, the name
 Of every shrub that blossoms bore,
 Creeper and tree unseen before;
 And Lakshman fetched at Sita's prayer
 Boughs of each tree with clusters fair."

As they approached Chitrakuta Rama thus addressed his lotus-eyed Sita:

"Look round thee, dear; each flowery tree
 Touched with the fire of morning see:
 The Kinsuk now the frosts are fled,—
 How glorious with his wreaths of red!
 The Bel trees see, so loved of men,
 Hanging their boughs in every glen,
 O'erburdened with their fruits and flowers;
 A plenteous store of food is ours.
 See, Lakshman, in the leafy trees,
 Where'er they make their home,
 Down hangs the work of laboring bees,
 The ponderous honeycomb.
 In the fair wood before us spread
 The startled wild-cock cries:
 Hark, where the flowers are soft to tread,
 The peacock's voice replies.
 Where elephants are roaming free,
 And sweet birds' songs are loud,
 The glorious Chitrakuta see;
 His peaks are in the cloud.

On fair smooth ground he stands displayed,
 Begirt by many a tree :
 O, brother, in that holy shade
 How happy shall we be ! " *—*Book II, Canto lvi.*

Rama's sorrow on returning home after Sita had been stolen away, is thus described :

" Longing to gaze on Sita's face,
 He hastened to his dwelling-place,
 Then, sinking 'neath his misery's weight,
 He looked, and found it desolate.
 Tossing his mighty arms on high,
 He sought her with an eager cry.
 From spot to spot he wildly ran,
 Each corner of his home to scan.
 He looked, but Sita was not there ;
 His cot was desolate and bare,
 Like streamlet in the winter frost,
 The glory of her lilies lost.
 With leafy tears the sad trees wept
 As a wild wind their branches swept.
 Mourned bird and deer, and every flower
 Drooped fainting round the lonely bower.
 The sylvan deities had fled
 The spot where all the light was dead,
 Where hermits coat of skin displayed,
 And piles of sacred grass were laid.
 He saw, and, maddened by his pain,
 Cried in lament again, again :
 ' Where is she, dead, or torn away,
 Lost, or some hungry giant's prey ?
 Or did my darling chance to rove
 For fruit and blossoms through the grove ?
 Or has she sought the pool or rill,
 Her pitecher from the wave to fill ?'
 His eager eyes, on fire with pain,
 He roamed about with maddened brain.
 Each grove and glade he searched with care ;
 He sought, but found no Sita there."—*Book III, Canto lxi.*

He rushed wildly through the forest, asking the various trees for tidings of the missing Sita. The kadamba, bel, arjun, basil,

* "We have often looked on that green hill," says a writer in the "*Calcutta Review*," (vol. xliii) : "it is the holiest spot of that sect of the Hindu faith who devote themselves to this incarnation of Vishnu. The whole neighborhood is Rama's country. Every head-land has some legend, every cavern is connected with his name ; some of the wild fruits are still called *sitaphal*, being the reputed food of the exiles. Thousands and thousands annually visit the spot, and round the hill is a raised footpath, on which the devotee, with naked feet, treads full of pious awe."

tila, asoka, palm, rose-apple, cassia, jasmine, mango, and sal, are all interrogated, but in vain. He then asks the deer, the elephant, and the tiger, but with no better success :

“ Thus as he cried in wild lament,
From grove to grove the mourner went,
Here for a moment sank to rest,
Then started up and onward pressed.
Thus roaming on like one distraught,
Still for his vanished love he sought.
He searched in wood and hill and glade,
By rock and brook and wild cascade.
Through groves with restless step he sped,
And left no spot unvisited.
Through lawns and woods of vast extent
Still searching for his love he went
With eager steps and fast.
For many a weary hour he toiled,
Still in his fond endeavor foiled,
Yet hoping to the last.”—*Book III, Canto Ixi.*

As before stated, Hanuman, the monkey-god, (who changed his size to suit his convenience,) went to Ceylon to find Sita. After slaying the warriors he set fire to the city :

THE BURNING OF LANKA.

“ ‘ What further deed remains to do
To vex the Raksha’s king anew ?
The beauty of his grove is marred,
Killed are the bravest of his guard.
The captains of his host are slain,
But forts and palaces remain.
Swift is the work and light the toil
Each fortress of the foe to spoil.’
Reflecting thus, his tail ablaze
As through the cloud red lightning plays,
He scaled the palaces, and spread
The conflagration where he sped.
From house to house he hurried on,
And the wild flames behind him shone.
Each mansion of the foe he scaled,
And furious fire its roof assailed,
Till all the common ruin shared :
Vibhishan’s house alone was spared.
From blazing pile to pile he sprang,
And loud his shout of triumph rang,
As roars the doomsday cloud when all
The worlds in dissolution fall.

The friendly wind conspired to fan
 The hungry flames that leapt and ran,
 And, spreading in their fury caught
 The gilded walls with pearls inwrought,
 Till each proud palace reeled and fell
 As falls a heavenly citadel.

Loud was the roar the demons raised
 'Mid walls that split and beams that blazed,
 As each with vain endeavor strove
 To stay the flames in house or grove.
 The women, with disheveled hair,
 Flocked to the roofs in wild despair,
 Shrieked out for succor, wept aloud,
 And fell like lightning from a cloud.
 He saw the flames ascend and curl
 Round turkis, diamond, and pearl,
 While silver floods and molten gold
 From ruined wall and lattice rolled.
 As fire grows fiercer as he feeds
 On wood and grass and crackling weeds,
 So Hanuman the ruin eyed
 With fury still unsatisfied."—*Book V, Canto liv.*

The conflict between the opposing armies of Rama and Ravan was long continued, and the description fills several cantos. The following is one of the closing scenes :

"With wondrous power and might and skill
 The giant fought with Rama still.
 Each at his foe his chariot drove,
 And still for death or victory strove.
 The warriors' steeds together dashed,
 And pole with pole re-echoing clashed.
 Then Rama, launching dart on dart,
 Made Ravan's coursers swerve and start.
 Nor was the lord of Lanka slow
 To rain his arrows on his foe,
 Who showed, by fiery points assailed,
 No trace of pain, nor shook nor quailed.
 Dense clouds of arrows Rama shot
 With that strong arm which rested not,
 And spear and mace and club and brand
 Fell in dire rain from Ravan's hand.
 The storm of missiles fiercely cast
 Stirred up the oceans with its blast,
 And serpent-gods and fiends who dwell
 Below were troubled by the swell.
 The earth with hill and plain and brook
 And grove and garden reeled and shook :
 The very sun grew cold and pale,
 And horror stilled the rising gale. . . .

Then to his deadly string the pride
 Of Raghu's race a shaft applied.
 Sharp as a serpent's venom'd fang
 Straight to its mark the arrow sprang.
 And from the giant's body shred
 With trenchant steel the monstrous head.
 There might the triple world behold
 That severed head adorned with gold.
 But when all eyes were bent to view,
 Swift in its stead another grew.
 Again the shaft was pointed well ;
 Again the head divided fell.
 But still as each to earth was cast
 Another head succeeded fast.
 A hundred, bright with fiery flame
 Fell low before the victor's aim,
 Yet Ravan by no sign betrayed
 That death was near or strength decayed.
 The doubtful fight he still maintained,
 And on his foe his missiles rained.
 In air, on earth, on plain, on hill,
 With awful might he battled still ;
 And through the hours of night and day
 The conflict knew no pause or stay."—*Book VI, Canto ciz.*

But at last Rama was victorious, and the poet tells of

RAVAN'S DEATH.

"Then Matali to Rama cried :
 'Let other arms the day decide.
 Why wilt thou strive with useless toil,
 And see his might thy efforts foil ?
 Launch at the foe thy dart whose fire
 Was kindled by the Almighty Sire.'
 He ceased : and Raghu's son obeyed :
 Upon his string the hero laid
 An arrow, like a snake that hissed,
 Whose fiery flight had never missed :
 The arrow Saint Agastya gave
 And blessed the chieftain's life to save ;
 That dart the Eternal Father made
 The monarch of the gods to aid ;
 By Brahma's self on him bestowed
 When forth to fight Lord Indra rode.
 'Twas feathered with the rushing wind ;
 The glowing sun and fire combined
 To the keen point their splendor lent ;
 The shaft, ethereal element,
 By Meru's hill and Mandar pride
 Of mountains, had its weight supplied.

He laid it on the twisted cord,
 He turned the point at Lanka's lord,
 And swift the limb-dividing dart
 Pierced the huge chest and cleft the heart,
 And dead he fell upon the plain
 Like Vritra by the Thunderer slain.
 The Raksha's host when Ravan fell
 Sent forth a wild terrific yell,
 Then turned and fled, all hope resigned,
 Through Lanka's gates, nor looked behind.
 His voice each joyous Vanar raised,
 And Rama, conquering Rama, praised.
 Soft from celestial minstrels came
 The sound of music and acclaim.
 Soft, fresh, and cool, a rising breeze
 Brought odors from the heavenly trees,
 And, ravishing the sight and smell,
 A wondrous rain of blossoms fell;
 And voices breathed round Raghu's son:
 'Champion of gods, well done, well done.'"

—Book VI, Canto cx.

One of the most striking passages in the poem is Sita's reply to Rama when he had charged her with infidelity:

"Struck down with overwhelming shame,
 She shrank within her trembling frame.
 Each word of Rama's like a dart
 Had pierced the lady to the heart;
 And from her sweet eyes unrestrained
 The torrent of her sorrows rained.
 Her weeping eyes at length she dried,
 And thus 'mid choking sobs replied:
 'Canst thou, a high-born prince, dismiss
 A high-born dame with speech like this?
 Such words befit the meanest hind,
 Not princely birth and generous mind.
 By all my virtuous life I swear
 I am not what thy words declare.
 If some are faithless, wilt thou find
 No love and truth in womankind?
 Doubt others if thou wilt, but own
 The truth which all my life has shown.
 If, when the giant seized his prey,
 Within his hated arms I lay,
 And felt the grasp I dreaded, blame
 Fate and the robber, not thy dame.
 What could a helpless woman do?
 My heart was mine and still was true.

* * * *

Is all forgotten, all ? my birth,
 Named Janak's child from fostering earth ?
 That day of triumph when, a maid,
 My trembling hand in thine I laid ?
 My meek obedience to thy will,
 My faithful love through joy and ill,
 That never failed at duty's call—
 O king, is all forgotten, all ?'

"To Lakshman then she turned and spoke,
 While sobs and sighs her utterance broke :
 'Sumitra's son, a pile prepare,
 My refuge in my dark despair.
 I will not live to bear this weight
 Of shame, forlorn and desolate.
 The kindled fire my woes shall end,
 And be my best and surest friend.'

His mournful eyes the hero raised,
 And wistfully on Rama gazed,
 In whose stern look no ruth was seen,
 No mercy for the weeping queen.
 No chieftain dared to meet those eyes,
 To pray, to question, or advise.

The word was passed, the wood was piled,
 And fain to die stood Janak's child.
 She slowly paced around her lord,
 The gods with reverent act adored,
 Then, raising suppliant hands, the dame
 Prayed humbly to the Lord of Flame :
 'As this fond heart by virtue awayed
 From Raghu's son has never strayed,
 So, universal witness, Fire
 Protect my body on the pyre.
 As Raghu's son has idly laid
 This charge on Sita, hear and aid.'

She ceased : and, fearless to the last,
 Within the flame's wild fury passed.
 Then rose a piercing cry from all,
 Dames, children, men, who saw her fall,
 Adorned with gems and gay attire,
 Beneath the fury of the fire."—*Book VI, Canto cxviii.*

The Lord of Fire rescues the faithful dame, and brings her
 forth unscathed :

"Fair as the morning was her sheen,
 And gold and gems adorned the queen.
 Her form in crimson robes arrayed,
 Her hair was bound in glossy braid.
 Her wreath was fresh and sweet of scent ;
 Undimmed was every ornament.

Then, standing close to Rama's side,
 The universal witness cried :
 ' From every blot and blemish free,
 Thy faithful queen returns to thee.' "—*Book VI, Canto cxx.*

Rama receives her, and the happy pair return triumphantly to Ajudhiya, where Rama ascends the throne to the delight of the people : and here the story ends.

The "Ramayan" of Tulsi Das is the popular version, to be found in all the bazars of the great cities of India. Tulsi Das was a Brahman of the highest class. He spent the most of his life at Benares, visiting as well the other famous cities of his native land. He began the composition of the "Ramayan" at Ajudhiya, in A. D. 1575, and died in 1580. Two copies of the poem in his own handwriting are said to be still in existence, the one at Rajapur, the other in the temple of Sita Rama, which he himself founded at Benares. In addition to this his great work, he was the author of six other poems, all in honor of Ram Chandra. In his introduction Mr. Growse says :

The introductory portion of the first book of the "Ramayan" is not only interesting as a *resumé* of popular Hindu theology and metaphysics, but is also curious as containing the author's vindication of himself against his critics. They attacked him for lowering the dignity of his subject by clothing it in the vulgar vernacular. However just his defense may be, it did not succeed in converting the opposite faction ; and the professional Sanskrit pundits, who are their modern representatives, still affect to despise his work as an unworthy concession to the illiterate masses. With this small and solitary exception the book is in every one's hands, from the court to the cottage, and is read or heard and appreciated alike by every class of the Hindu community, whether high or low, rich or poor, young or old.

One quotation must suffice—from "Breaking of the Bow :"

Rama first looked at the crowd, who all stood dumb and still as statues ; then the gracious lord turned from them to Sita, and perceived her yet deeper concern ; perceived her to be so terribly agitated that a moment of time seemed an age in passing. If a man die of thirst for want of water, when he is once dead, of what use to him is a lake of water ? What good is the rain when the crop is dead ? or what avails regret when a chance has once been lost ? Thinking thus to himself as he gazed at Janaki, the lord was enraptured at the sight of her singular devotion, and, after making a reverential obeisance to his *guru*,* he took up the bow with most superlative ease ; as he grasped it in his hands it gleamed

* Religious instructor.

like a flash of lightning; and again, as he bent it, it seemed like the vault of heaven. Though all stood looking on, before any one could see he had lifted it from the ground and raised it aloft and drawn it tight, and in a moment broken it in halves; the awful crash re-echoed through the world.

So awful a crash re-echoed through the world that the horses of the sun started from their course, the elephants of the four quarters groaned, earth shook, the great serpent, the boar, and the tortoise tottered. Gods, demons, and saints put their hands to their ears, and all began anxiously to consider the cause; but when they learned that Rama had broken the bow they uttered shouts of victory.*

It may be remarked, in passing, that an acquaintance with this poem, "the one common and everlasting possession of the Hindus," is of great help to the missionary as he goes about preaching to these idolatrous millions. As he begins his conversation with a group of villagers seated around the public well, or gathered at some great fair, it helps him amazingly to be able to make a quotation from Tulsi Das; *exempli gratia*, the following:

"Bhe pragat Kripálá | dina dayála | Kaushalyá hitakári,
Harkhit mahtári | muni manhári | adbhut rup Nihári,
Lochan abhirámá | tanu dhan shyámá | nij ayudh bhiy chári,
Bhushan banmálá | nayun bishálá | shobhásiudu Kharári." †

This stanza is from the "Ram Pariksha," (Ram Tested,) a very excellent and popular vernacular tract written years ago by the Rev. Mr. Sternberg, and widely circulated throughout North India. The tract gives extracts from the "Ramayan," and makes a comparison between Ram Chandra and our blessed Saviour. Some reference to the national epic serves as a fitting introduction to what we have to say about the sinless Incarnation. Ram *is* being tested. And the day will come when these millions who now yield heartiest homage to the son of Dasaratha and Kaushalya, and worship his image in thousands of temples, shall join in the praise and worship of the Lord Jesus Christ. If only the coming of the glad day could be hastened!

* Growse's "Ramayan," Book i, p. 145.

† Literally translated: "Then appeared he who is merciful, pitiful to the poor, the beloved of Kaushalya. Beholding his wonderful form, his mother was delighted, and the hearts of the munis were ravished. His eyes most pleasing, his body dark blue like the clouds, in his four hands bearing his special weapons. Garlanded to his feet, his eyes large, a sea of beauty, was the enemy of Khar."

ART. VII.—THE ITINERANT MINISTRY OF THE METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH.

If there had never been such a constitution as that now existing in the Methodist Episcopal Church; if such a plan of ministerial distribution had been wrought out in theory and submitted for acceptance or rejection without previous successful experiment, there is no reason to suppose that one vote in a thousand would be given for its adoption. Not founded on the Scriptures, though not contrary to them, not based on any primary or secondary prelatical authority, involving the surrender of abstract rights, and apparently in most, and really in many, particulars incongruous with the spirit of modern democratic institutions, it would be generally and immediately rejected. Those even who might see in it great possibilities if any denomination of Christians could be induced to accept it, would consider it so contrary to the independent temper of the age as to be utterly impracticable. Yet it exists. Its growth has been contemporary with that of the Republic, its many thousands of ministers and millions of laymen on the one hand submitting to its requirements, and on the other being the staunchest advocates of personal independence in the State. The explanation of the phenomenon is that which solves so many otherwise impossible problems—constitutions and governments, in Church and State, "*grow*," are not made."

ORIGIN AND GROWTH OF THE ITINERANT SYSTEM.

When John Wesley began to preach the only visible bond of union between his converts was himself. Even the "Society" was not formed. But men heard, believed, were converted, sought association, and acknowledged Wesley to be the head; the work grew, and men of "gifts, grace, and usefulness" were commissioned by him to exhort and preach. They went only where he sent them, did what he directed, and departed for other fields at his bidding. The numbers increased and formed many Societies; the "helpers" were called together in conference, but had no power of decision. Wesley heard, and when all had finished announced the policy to be pursued. In process of time the limit of possible connection with circuits

and stations (except in the case of ordained ministers of the Church of England) was fixed at three years. But the ministers had become numerous, able, and learned, the Societies self-supporting and somewhat exacting. Wesley grew old, and saw that, unless provision was made, at his death the body would fall into Congregationalism. To prevent this he executed the famous deed transferring the property and all rights held by him to the "Legal Hundred." The success of the Connection, the personal relations of ministry and laity, the property interests involved, produced a coherence and momentum which carried the great body of adherents in safety over the chasm occasioned by Wesley's death; and the Wesleyan "Church" or "Denomination" became thoroughly compacted.

Before Wesley died its government was an ecclesiastical monarchy, absolute in theory, but with many concessions granted to ministers and laity, which, as time passed, made it, like the Government of England, a Limited Monarchy. At the formation of the "Legal Hundred" its government became more analogous to that of an "Aristocracy," though modified by all the rights enjoyed by the people. In the United States, prior to the sending over of ministers with authority from Wesley, there was no legal connection between the different *nuclei* of Methodism in the North and the South. When Asbury assumed jurisdiction he claimed, and the preachers accorded to him, the same power exercised in England by Wesley. The Minutes of the Conference for 1779 close with these questions:

Quest. 12. Ought not Brother Asbury to act as general assistant in America? He ought: 1st, on account of his age; 2d, because originally appointed by Mr. Wesley; 3d, being joined with Messrs. Rankin and Shadford, by express order from Mr. Wesley.

Quest. 13. How far shall his power extend? On hearing every preacher for and against what is in debate, the right of determination shall rest with him, according to the Minutes.

From that time, with considerable trouble and opposition, he exercised his powers, deciding questions, stationing and removing men, until the Revolution was ended and Dr. Coke had arrived. Then the Societies and preachers adhering to Asbury, with the class-meetings, itineracy, and all the peculiarities of Methodism, formed the Methodist Episcopal Church, the his-

tory of which momentous transaction being thus stated in the Minutes for 1785, after the publication of the letter brought from John Wesley by Thomas Coke :

Therefore at this Conference we formed ourselves into an independent Church; and, following the counsel of Mr. John Wesley, who recommended the Episcopal form of Church government, we thought it best to become an Episcopal Church, making the Episcopal office elective, and the elected Superintendent or Bishop amenable to the body of ministers and preachers.

From 1785, as from the beginning until then, the Superintendent or Bishop, with no time-limit except one for each case made in his own discretion, stationed the preachers, until 1792, when the following rule was adopted :

Quest. 4. How long may the Bishops allow an elder to preside in the same district ?

Ans. For any term not exceeding four years successively.

Emory's foot-note on this question is as follows :

This restriction (for originally there was none) is said to have been introduced in consequence of the evil results of a more protracted term in the case of James O'Kelly, who had been Presiding Elder in the southern part of Virginia ever since the organization of the Church, besides having been stationed there several years before, and who thus acquired a power to injure the Church by his secession which otherwise he would not have possessed.

But there was no restriction on the discretion of the Bishops in fixing the terms of the appointments of ordinary preachers until 1804, when the following rule was passed :

Providing he (the Bishop) shall not allow any preacher to remain in the same station more than two years successively; excepting the Presiding Elders, the Editor and General Book Steward, the Assistant Editor and General Book Steward, the supernumerary, superannuated, and worn-out preachers.

At that time there were no "Missionary Society," with its "Corresponding Secretaries," no "editors and assistant editors at Auburn, Pittsburgh, Chicago, St. Louis, Portland, San Francisco, Atlanta, and New Orleans," no "missionaries to Indians, Welsh, Swedes, Norwegians, neglected portions of our cities," to "people of color, and on foreign stations." There certainly was no call on the Methodist Episcopal Church to furnish

"chaplains to reformatory, sanitary, and charitable institutions, to prisons, and in the army and navy," nor for secretaries or agents of the American Bible Society. None of our ministers were required to be "presidents, principals, or teachers in seminaries of learning," for we had few such institutions in 1804. And in those days of virtual ostracism we were not likely to be asked to furnish professors to "any seminary of learning not under our care." Nor was the "Five Points Mission in New York" nor "the American Chapel in Paris" among "the things that are." The history of these exceptions is the record of the growth of the Church in numbers, intelligence, wealth, and influence, and is interwoven with that of other denominations and of the United States. The editors, agents, corresponding secretaries, and teachers, have special professions or kinds of business to master and conduct; while the chaplains, city missionaries, and "those who may be appointed to labor for the benefit of seamen," have "itinerant" congregations.

At the General Conference of 1844 the rule concerning the length of a presiding elder's term in the same district was made to read thus: "For any term not exceeding four years successively. After which he shall not be appointed to the same district for six years." In 1872 it was provided that "presiding elders in Missions and Mission Conferences in heathen lands may be appointed to the same district for *more than four* consecutive years." At the General Conference of 1844 the following additional proviso was enacted respecting the appointment of the preachers:

Provided, also, that, with the exceptions above named, he shall not continue a preacher in the same appointment more than two years in six, nor in the same city more than four years in succession, nor return him to it after such term of service till he shall have been absent four years.

This proviso was repealed in 1856. At the Conference of 1864 the rule enacted in 1804, limiting the term of possible service to *two* years, was made to read thus, "*Provided*, also, that with the exceptions above named he shall not continue a preacher in the same appointment more than *three* years in *six*."

So this unique system, which could never have been contrived and established as a whole, has grown and solidified. And now the Superintendents or Bishops, endowed with their

prerogatives by the whole Church in General Conference assembled, before a delegated General Conference was needed or projected; and maintained in the exercise of their authority by the Restrictive Rules (which define the powers never transferred by the ministry and membership to the delegated General Conference) and by the subsequent enactments of said delegated General Conference, have *theoretically* absolute power and discretion in fixing the appointments of the preachers, being amenable to the General Conference for the proper exercise of the functions of their office. So tremendous is their power in theory; but *practically* they receive counsel from the Presiding Elders and communications from both preachers and people, giving stability to the machinery by their final determining prerogative, which, though not now frequently exercised *ex cathedra*, is, like the "discretion" of a judge of the highest court, "not to be appealed from." But when the limit of three years is reached their authority and discretion end. They are themselves subject to law, and if they were to presume to appoint the most useful and popular man, under the ordinary procedure, for a fourth year, it would be an act in the Bishop attempting it of rebellion against the General Conference and the Denomination which would compel his expulsion from office. In no case has it been attempted by a Bishop, though a few instances of stretching the exceptions allowed, to cover special emergencies, have occurred, without in every case being as carefully scrutinized by the succeeding General Conference as they should have been. In this system the appointments are made annually, and the Bishop presiding at the Conference is required to give an appointment to every "effective" member of the Conference not under charges or sentence of suspension.

Every Church, under this system, must receive the minister appointed. It may protest, and object, and temporarily refuse, and by an exercise of "discretion" on the part of the Bishop it may gain its end; but if the issue be fairly joined, and the Bishop refuse to change the appointment, the Church *must* succumb, or be cut off from the body. In like manner every minister *must* go to his appointment. He may persuade, argue, implore, and convince "episcopal discretion," and so be appointed elsewhere than at first announced. But if the decree

be not changed he must go, or locate, withdraw, or become a subject of ecclesiastical discipline.

Under the operation of this complex mechanism ten thousand ministers, many of them the equals in experience, learning, eloquence, piety, and local public esteem of those who appoint them, are sent from place to place, compelled to remove at least as often as once in every three years, the whole body averaging as often as once in two years. And ten thousand Churches part on a set day with their pastors, some gladly, some willingly, some doubtfully, some very sadly; to receive others, some very sadly, some doubtfully, some willingly, and some gladly. While the number of ministers who will not go and of Churches that will not receive those who are sent, is so very small as scarcely to be a factor in the estimate of the results of the working of the system.

Many of those who observe the Denomination from without only, and some who, though within, have not carefully studied it, ask why we do, and how we can, submit to it. One answer will meet both questions. We submit to it because we approve it, and we approve it because of the immense and otherwise unattainable advantages which it confers upon the Denomination as a whole. Every thing finite must have the virtues and "defects of its qualities;" and the value of a system is ascertained by experience, and the estimate confirmed by analysis and comparison.

PECULIAR ADVANTAGES OF THE ITINERACY.

The present time and place are suitable to point out even to some who enjoy without properly estimating them the peculiar advantages of the itineracy. It will, of course, be necessary to re-state well known and "oft told truths," but the writer believes that certain considerations herewith presented have not often, if ever, been brought forward in vindication of the system of periodical transfers of the ministry. That a great work has been done by a settled ministry, and that vigorous and healthy Churches are now maintained by it, no one can doubt; and any allusions to defects in that plan are not made in a spirit of hostility to those denominations which are organized under it, but simply as necessary to the full exhibition of the subject from our point of view.

1. The itineracy provides all Churches with pastors, and all

pastors with fields of labor. In some other denominations, according to their own reports, less than one half the Churches have settled pastors, the rest having "stated supplies," transient preaching, or being destitute of pulpit ministrations. While this is the case with the Churches, between one third and one fourth of the ministers anxious to preach are without settlements or calls. The following extract is from the "Congregationalist" of September 10, 1879 :

AN EXPERIENCE MEETING.

Time, Monday, 9 A. M.; place, a corner of the Congregational Book-store; occasion, a cluster of men discussing vacant pulpits and their method of supply. Though composed of ministers it was a *live* meeting; perhaps because there was no attempt to preach or theorize, only simply heart-felt statement of personal experience and feeling. For obvious reasons other letters have been substituted for the true initials.

Brother B. was speaking. "For my part I must say I am sick of this whole business. I love to preach; it has been my loved vocation for a score of years, and if there were anywhere an open door to a field however humble, where the salary would keep body and soul together, I would gladly work on for the Master; but this coming here week after week to make one of a crowd of disappointed applicants not only disheartens, but humiliates me in a way that I do not believe good for any man."

"True, Brother B., but what can we do?"

"Sure enough, what can we? If I knew I would not only tell others, but act for myself. I see and feel the evils of our system, but how to remedy them is another thing."

"There are nine of us," spoke up Brother F., "that came in here last Saturday hoping for a chance to preach somewhere as a supply or candidate. How many of us did preach?"

Two hands were raised, and their owners explained that in one case it was gratuitous assistance for a friend, and in the other the result of an arrangement made outside the Congregational House. "Well," continued Brother F., "I happen to know of four others who last Saturday made personal application in this building for places to preach. I presume Mr. Sargent could tell us of many others, and then we all know that both here and in the 'bureau' above they have on file a large and increasing list of applications from ministers all over New England, and from the regions beyond."

"What success did the four have?"

"Of these four, one was sent out by our good brother in charge of the book-store, in response to the only single, solitary call that came from any Church whatsoever to any party in this building. The other three went, one to a temporary boarding-place he has

hired for himself and wife a few miles out, his goods stored meanwhile a hundred miles from here; one to his home down on the Cape, and the other to his home beyond the Connecticut River. His car fare, I happen to know, was \$6 90; he brought his lunch with him, but he spent five cents for a cup of coffee."

"How much family has he?"

"Five children and an invalid sister."

"How much salary has he had?"

"Six years ago it was \$1,200 and parsonage, then it was cut down to \$1,000, again reduced to \$800, and last year it was \$650, and no vacation. Fifty dollars are still due."

"Why did he come so far on an uncertainty?"

"He told me that he was getting desperate; that he had been at home five Sabbaths without employment, and that he felt he must do something or go somewhere, and so he came on to make inquiries in person."

"What does the 'ministerial bureau' accomplish anyway?"

Brother S. responded: "It has never done any thing for me except to put my letters on file; but then I do not blame the bureau; it would gladly help us all to places if it could, but when all the applications come from the ministers, and none from the Churches, it makes it a one-sided affair, a market where it is all supply and no demand."

Over against this place the fact that there is not one Methodist Church desiring a pastor, and able to support him, without one, and not one "effective" Methodist preacher "standing all day idle in the vineyard because no man hath hired him."

2. It stimulates the growth of young Churches. It does this by supplying them with men of greater ability than they could without it secure. Many of them could not offer any minister such inducements that he would voluntarily settle there; but under the itineracy the hardship is shared, and the preacher encouraged and sustained "with the assurance of a better appointment next year." By this plan it has been made impossible for the emigrant, the miner, or even the hunter, to get beyond the reach of the Methodist itinerant, "who forms a class and gives notice of preaching wherever two or three can be got together." Except by their missionary efforts, necessarily circumscribed, other denominations can accomplish little in this way, for under the regular operations of the system of settled pastors Societies must first be formed and the minister receive a call.

3. It confers peculiar benefits on the minister. He is compelled to mingle very much in society, for the spirit of a re-

cluse is fatal to his success. He is brought in close contact, in the course of years, with a very large number of persons, much larger than the ordinary settled pastor can reach. By this his knowledge of human nature is greatly enlarged. For this wisdom cannot be acquired in the closet; and by it alone men of limited acquirements frequently attain to the front rank in every sphere of public life, while where it is deficient the greatest erudition is comparatively useless.

It promotes physical vigor. To say nothing of the healthful influence of changes of climate and scenery, after preaching for two or three years to the same congregation the vital force of many men becomes exhausted. In such a state three months' labor may confirm a consumption, or permanently shatter the nervous system. The delivery of sermons, except when the vocal organs are diseased, is not unhealthy, but the mental and nervous exhaustion produced by their preparation often is. Could the failing minister be relieved from that for a few months, though still preaching, his powers would recuperate, but if settled he fears lest his resignation should be construed into a want of ability; he does not wish to ask for a long furlough because he cannot do without his salary, or lest his people should fancy that they are to have an invalid fastened upon them; and so many struggle on and break down. In the itineracy the periodic changes allow this rest, the necessity of making new acquaintances takes him out in the open air, and gives the *stimulus* to healthful exercise. If worn with a heavy city charge, a quiet rural station can be assigned him, or wherever he may be sent his pulpit preparations previously accumulated are for a time available.

Under this plan no minister is ever *required* to "candidate." If committees, self-constituted or official, go to hear him or ask him to preach on trial, he may be entirely inactive if he possess the requisite spirit. While in other systems, except in rare instances, voluntary and conscious "candidating," frequently not followed by "effectual calling," and always attended by humiliating anxiety, is unavoidable.

Many, if not most, ministers require the stimulus of variety to keep them at their best. This a new Church, congregation, Sabbath-school and community, furnish; and they place the minister under the necessity of making a new reputation for

himself. There is, to noble minds, a powerful incitement in the fact of having a position already achieved to sustain; but human nature is weak, and very many are tempted to rely on a reputation already established for permanent consideration, and thus relax effort. Under the plan of regular transfers the minister is ever under the conviction that his influence is to be gained, and that he has no time to waste. That evils may hence arise is obvious, but their examination belongs to another part of the subject.

The wide circle of attached friends which the minister forms in his changes contributes greatly to his happiness, and the relief he feels in being removed from some who have done all in their power to harass him, even though he may have had great general success, is not to be despised. The comfort which the certainty that as long as he is able to toil there will be a place for him, however humble, provided by the Church, is greater than that furnished by an endowment policy of many thousands in the best life assurance company in the world. For that could give only money; this insures friends, the opportunity to labor for Christ and humanity, and the necessities, if not the luxuries, of existence. The support, also, in the discharge of duty when opposed by the narrow, the worldly, or the sinful, afforded by the thought that the struggle will soon end by removal, and that these foes will not be able to prevent another appointment, may with great force be contrasted with the sinking of heart which the settled minister must feel when he perceives that if he is faithful he cannot stay, and if he is dislodged by opposition it will debar him from receiving another call.

But there is one capital advantage which the itinerant enjoys that few seem to have weighed. It is the opportunity of correcting and avoiding any errors into which he may have fallen, without jeopardizing or ruining his influence. To depart from a policy already adopted, and strenuously supported, by the minister, in the same Church, is always difficult even in small things, and most dangerous in great matters; but in the discharge of his functions in another place he may, after mature reflection, deem it wise to adopt the very plan he had rejected. And he can do this without humiliation or controversy.

4. For the whole Church the distribution of different gifts in nearly equal proportions is desirable. Marked individuality

in ministers settled for many years has a tendency to stamp "their image and superscription" on their devoted parishioners. As the symmetrical unfolding of nature and grace gives the ideal type of the Christian, so the ideal Christian minister is one who, devoted to Christ, is argumentative and discriminating enough to instruct the Church, imaginative enough to attract and inspire with hope, and emotional enough to affect the heart with suitable feelings. But where is that ideal man? In one, logic predominates; in another, poetry; in a third, pathos. The best statement on this subject is from the pen of Abel Stevens:

Many men of fervid spirit and deep piety have little talent for disciplining the Church. Their discourses are chiefly hortative; they are instrumental in great revivals and additions to the membership. It is obvious that such talents need a rapid distribution. The soul must not only be converted, but trained in piety. By an itinerant system such men are changed from position to position, arousing dull Churches, breaking up new ground, invading and reclaiming ungodly neighborhoods. By the same system prudent men, with talents for instructing and edifying the converted masses, follow the former, gathering up and securing the fruits of their labors. Some pastors are addicted chiefly to experimental and practical preaching, others to the illustration and defense of doctrinal truth. Some are more effectual in the social services, others in the ministration of the pulpit. Some have ability only for spiritual labors; others are skillful in managing and invigorating the fiscal resources of the Church, in erecting new chapels, and promoting the benevolent enterprises of the times.

Further: Changes in the pastorate under any system are inevitable. Most men are not able to sustain themselves in the same charge for more than two or three years. All things considered, there must be an increase of attractiveness to preserve a given degree of interest, for it is the same voice, manner, man, addressing the same congregation from one hundred to one hundred and fifty times a year. If the pastor succeeds he will receive a call to some more desirable field of labor. Death makes vacancies, and disturbances from unforeseen causes are liable at any time to arise. There is under other systems an interval between the removal of one pastor and the settlement of another. And frequently no settlement can be effected without the secret or open dissatisfaction of a large minority. When a pastor is disliked from any cause, and his friends are numerous or strong, the dissatisfied are driven to do one of

three things : to hear a man whom they do not like, to leave the Church, or to create such a disturbance that he must resign. The average Church member will not do the first, and is not likely to do the second ; hence the worst passions are aroused, and Churches are rent into hostile factions. Such a conflict over a minister works immeasurable evil in a community. It is, however, in proportion to the great number of Societies, of unfrequent occurrence in the Methodist Episcopal Church ; and this, not because its members and ministers are more patient or less excitable and persistent than others, but because it is obviously irrational and useless to risk the ruin of the Church on account of a minister, when at the best he can be enjoyed, or at the worst he must be endured, for but a short time. Whatever, then, has a strong general tendency to preserve the peace of the Church is of great value. It also exerts a great influence over the spirit of unity in the denomination. This is so obvious as to require but the briefest statement. In twenty years the same minister will have been pastor of more than six Churches in different parts of a State. His friends in them all observe his career and note with sympathy and interest his various changes, and thus, through him, become informed concerning other Churches. It is this which accounts, in great part, for the interest which Methodists feel in the dedicating of new churches, and for the great interest which the laity feel in the Annual Conferences, and the pleasure they derive from attending their sessions. Every member of the Church, of any considerable age, has the personal acquaintance of many ministers, and has heard others spoken of as likely, some day, to be his pastor. The pleasure which most Methodist laymen feel in the friendship of the various ministers with whom they have been brought into close relations, and whom they could never have intimately known but for the itineracy, is greater than they sometimes think, unless their attention is directed to it. In a word, the Methodist has more inducements and opportunities to become acquainted with the ministers, and societies, and general enterprises of the Denomination to which he belongs, than others can have.

Nor should the membership of the Church forget the relief it has from the disturbances incident to the trial of ministers on charges of doctrinal unsoundness or moral delinquency. The

suitableness of the candidate for the ministry is first passed on by the laity, but not with reference to his being the pastor of those who recommend him; the Annual Conference decides whether to receive him on trial. After admission a yearly opportunity is given to bring any charge against him; his trial does not take place in the Church of which he is pastor, nor, if innocent and yet damaged, does his failure to be reappointed permanently embarrass him or the Society he leaves.

If during the year accusations are made, investigation may be had at once, and its place may be located at a distance from his station. All this depends on the itineracy. Contrast its operation with the uncertainty, confusion, fierce excitement, heart-burnings, and public scandal attending the trials of ministers under other systems; especially where the laity of the Church of which the accused is the pastor are of necessity his judges; or where the lay members and permanent pastors of neighboring Churches are involved either as counsel, witnesses, or judges.

5. But it is as the bulwark of sound doctrine that the itineracy commends itself to every sincere believer in the doctrines and lover of the spirit of Methodism. Most of the heresies and errors which have rent the Church in all ages have been introduced by ministers and teachers of theology, and by them disseminated among the people. When a heretical minister is long settled in one place, if a man of force, he impresses his errors upon the people. It was in this manner that the Unitarian secession in New England arose, which took a third of the Congregational Churches. Ministers preached these sentiments until they gained sufficient adherents to take the Church with them. This could never be done in the Methodist Episcopal Church. The preacher of false doctrines remains at the longest but three years the pastor of one congregation. It is impossible for him to eradicate in so short a time the seeds of truth planted by his predecessors. And on his departure a man both sound in doctrine and able to defend and establish the truth may be appointed to fill his place.

Hence secessions of heretical ministers, accompanied by their Churches, are unknown among us. The heretic may go, but he goes alone, and if, like Robert Laird Collier, he return to the vicinity of his former pastorate, he finds his old pulpit occupied by a shepherd able to protect the fold. Or he may stay,

if he care to and can, but the reputation of uttering unsound sentiments will follow him from place to place, and his influence will wane.

EVILS INCIDENT TO THE SYSTEM.

But great as these advantages are, we cannot close our eyes to the fact that there are certain evils incident to the system. It is necessary, however, that in contemplating evils we should ascertain the value of any compensations which may exist. It is said that the arbitrary removal of ministers frequently terminates revivals and leaves young converts uncared for; the minister is preparing to leave and the people to receive a new pastor, and that the departing pastor is unable to transfer the mental and moral history of converts from his own mind to that of his successor. It must be admitted that this liability exists, and that sometimes there is a serious loss here. But where the converts are placed under proper leaders in classes, and are converted to Christ and to his Churches rather than to the pastor, this loss can be made very small. Many revivals also would terminate, in any event, very soon, and many revivals are caused by the extra efforts occasioned and the greater interest of the people and the pastor enkindled by the knowledge that they must *soon separate*. It must also be remembered that where there has been no revival and no probability exists of one at that time, the coming of a new pastor often arouses the whole community, and great are the results in the first year. Then ample opportunity is afforded to train converts. It is not denied that there is a loss, but affirmed that it is not necessarily large, and that these compensations are important.

It is alleged that it lays a burden upon thoughtful and modest men, and offers a premium to the flippant and superficial, and enables indolent men, secure in the certainty of a place, to repeat their old routine of sermons. Concerning this it may be said that the itineracy bears heavily upon *diffident* men, but the contact with the world which it requires tends to remove the defect, so that the Methodist minister is proverbially free from diffidence. And the superficial certainly have some advantages in a system of change. But it is not a paradise for the indolent man, whose old sermons, grown stale to

himself, are flat to the people, and in a little while he is stationed with difficulty and moved annually, increasing the rapidity of his revolutions with the diminution of his orbit, until his natural *inertia* brings his career to an end.

It may with truth be said that there is some loss of power when those who are succeeding are removed. The knowledge of the persons composing a Society, except as it reflects light on human nature in general, ceases to be of use. It requires a long time to become acquainted with a new congregation. After men pass forty years of age the difficulty of remembering names and faces becomes very great. Habits of study are broken up, and a great amount of otherwise superfluous calling is required. This, however, is not in practice as serious an evil as it seems. The class-meeting affords great opportunities of rapidly forming acquaintances. The writer is pastor of more than a thousand communicants, yet by visiting the fifteen classes of the Church, he met, under the best circumstances, in six weeks, more than three hundred members. The identification of individuals is greatly facilitated by the same institution. The people, under the requirements of the case, are social, and meet the pastor fully half way, while a promptness of approach on his part is not only permitted but expected. As the retiring pastor endeavors to correct his records and atone for any apparent neglect, and the new-comer must become acquainted, the *whole* people are quite sure to be visited at least twice in every two or three years, even if pastors were disposed to neglect this duty. We do not deny a loss of power, but admit it to be in some instances very serious. Yet it is not as great as it seems, and he who guards against it may reduce it very much. And in genuine Methodist Churches, where the class-meeting, that great "compensator," is maintained, it becomes still less.

The gravest charge made against the system is, that it renders local influence impossible. It will be found, however, when a comparison is made to our disadvantage, that some such man as Dr. Storrs, of Brooklyn, who is of transcendent ability, has grown up with the city, is pastor of a congregation of great wealth and commercial, professional, political, and social influence, is compared with an ordinary pastor of a Methodist Church. But let the comparison be made fairly, and several things will be observed. 1. That when a minister has been

stationed for many years in the same city, and is adapted to it, he can attain great local influence, which he does not lose by being transferred from one Society to another. The influence of Dr. A. S. Hunt, in the directions in which his tastes led him, was and is second to but few ministers of any standing in the city of Brooklyn. The number of men in other denominations of *great* local influence is not very large, though particular instances are conspicuous. It is not maintained that we have as many, but our average ministers have more influence of this local kind than that large proportion of settled ministers who are supposed not to be succeeding, and have a hostile minority ready to make capital against them out of the smallest error they may commit. But in a republic there is another kind of influence than that just referred to. It is the power of arousing and stirring the people. Into that power enter enthusiasm, facility in speech, novelty of method, fearlessness, experience in various emergencies, and close connection with the masses of the people. It is this which promotes revivals, all reforms which spring from the impulses of men, great temperance movements, and which resists the insidious encroachments of Romanism or Communism. This kind of influence the Methodist preacher can attain anywhere, and he and his brethren are leaders in these movements every-where. "How is it," said an eminent citizen, referring to a minister of our Church, "that he has a greater hold of the people than those who have lived here all their lives?" "Thank God," said a distinguished professional man in New York, a warden in an Episcopal Church, "we have one Denomination in this country that can be relied on to check the Romanists whenever they show their teeth." And thus the sum total of ten pastorates of three years in as many places may be greater than that of a successful man in one position, and is certainly immeasurably greater than that of an ordinary man.

But we concede that certain things can be done more efficiently under a settled ministry than under an itinerant. Churches can be sustained in certain localities in cities where, under our plan, it is difficult, if not impossible. We hold, nevertheless, that if the incidental disabilities were "ten times greater than they are" the advantages of the system would far outweigh them.

PROPOSAL TO REMOVE THE LIMITATION.

There are those among us who come forward with a plan which they claim will remove at once every disadvantage and secure to us all the advantages of an itineracy, and those also of a settled ministry. They affirm that the only thing that needs alteration to effect this result is to remove the *limitation*. Let all things remain as they are, let the appointments be made annually, but let pastors be reappointed for successive years as long as the Bishops think it best. This proposition has the merit of simplicity, and would require nothing but a vote of the General Conference to render it legal. There are no constitutional restrictions to prevent it. A majority of one can make it possible for any minister to spend his life where he is, providing that at the successive Annual Conferences the Bishops should re-appoint him.

In attacking the time-limit principles are advanced identical with those urged against the itineracy as a whole. But those who favor the proposition affirm that they love the itineracy, and hope that it will be maintained. One position taken strikes the writer as most singular, and implying a remarkable view of "Providence." "The present rule sets aside the indications of Providence, and substitutes an unbending iron rule of man's device. You may follow Providence within the limit of three years, but after that no call or demand of a providential character can be heeded."

But is not an annual appointment making a limit for Providence? Ten thousand men are appointed for a *year*. Nothing but immorality, insanity, heresy, voluntary withdrawal, or disease, or death, can remove them. There they must remain.

No man can vote till he is twenty-one years old, yet some are better qualified at sixteen than others at forty. Is not an heir born in this country "providentially" prevented from controlling his property till he is twenty-one, even if man devised the restriction? Judges are retired at seventy, and ineligible to reappointment. When a limit is a fact Providence takes cognizance of it. This limit of three years was made, as was supposed, in harmony with providential indications drawn from the state of the whole Church. The thing to be done is to show that those indications have changed. A man may fol-

low the indications of Providence till they lead him to make a contract which he cannot, without immorality, violate.

The proposition to remove the limitation, simple and harmless as it seems, contains in it elements which would render many of the advantages now guaranteed impossible, and in a short time put an end to the itineracy. It has been said by an advocate of the removal of the time restriction: "I realize that thousands of old men *feel* that the itineracy is bound up with this restriction. In the Church South, the restriction was repealed, (I believe in 1868,) but the majority were so moved by the tears of the fathers (who felt that Methodism had been stabbed to the heart) that they repealed their action before the session ended. I perceive and honor this *feeling*; but I know that it is only feeling. In a short life I have witnessed great changes of feeling in men and bodies of men."

The writer neither *feels* nor *thinks* that the itineracy is bound up with *this* restriction. But he believes that it is bound up with *a* restriction, a "time-limit" of some kind, contingent up to a certain point, but at that point invincible. And if he should prove to be "old" enough to attempt to substitute feeling or unsupported assertion for facts and reasoning, it will not be difficult to satisfy the Church of it. Indeed, no service can be rendered to a reform greater than a full statement of the views of its opponents. At the same time, to expose the fallacies in impracticable theories serves the cause of truth. The proposition we maintain is this: a limitation by law is essential to the successful working and permanency of the itineracy.

1. Under a limitation the appointments are made in the discretion of the appointing power until the limit is reached. The will of the Bishop determines when the pastor shall go, whether he shall return once or twice. Loyalty requires him to go or stay. But, according to his appointment, when the constitutional limit is reached the Bishop becomes "weak as other men." It is now the whole Denomination which compels the incumbent to move, and he cannot resist. If the Bishop, the Minister, and the Church, should combine, it would avail nothing. Hence it is impossible for the man to stay, and though he may go with the tears of the people mingling with his own, there is no outcry against the Bishop. But let all limitation be removed, and the exercise of Episcopal discretion is the

sole "efficient cause" of the otherwise unnecessary removal of their beloved pastor, and the people are grieved and indignant, while he feels oppressed. And after a pastor should have been settled many years in a place, if the people desired him to remain, it would be impossible to remove him without his consent. It would be useless to talk to either about the good of the Denomination as long as both were satisfied.

But it may be said, If both are satisfied, why separate them at all? The answer is manifold. It is not always a proof that the Church is prospering because the minister and the people are pleased with each other. A course of reciprocal flattery renders delight in each other, and spiritual, and sometimes temporal decline, compatible. If the Society is really prosperous, it can endure a change, while there may be another Church which that very minister might, if honorably removed to it, at once develop into a great power. But great changes would surely be introduced in Methodist usages, doctrine, and discipline. One minister believing in the annihilation of the wicked, another preaching hope for all, a third winking at dancing, card-playing, theater-going, a fourth indifferent to class-meetings, these could all, and easily, stamp their peculiarities on their congregations, and great dissimilarities in usages, doctrine, and discipline, would soon appear. If the germs of these things are planted "in the green tree, what would they do in the dry?" Then, when these evils should have become obvious, and it would seem necessary to remove the man to save the Church, the cry of persecution would be raised, those whom he had infected would gather around him, and he would remain or divide the Church. This result would be the more sure because, under a ministry likely to be permanent, those who sympathize with a peculiar style gather around its embodiment, and those who dislike it (unless they remain as a turbulent element) depart.

2. As men supposed by themselves and their people to be succeeding would not move, the work of the appointing power would be to find places for those who left under the stigma of failure. Its action would thus be regarded with disfavor in advance, and would be much more vigorously resisted than in similar instances at present, because laymen would feel, that if they received the appointee, he might stay for an indefinite

period. The work of the Bishops would be greatly complicated by the fact of there being no *certain* and *foreknown* vacancy, and no *certain* and *foreseen* removal. For example: in other Churches A. resigns and departs; a vacancy is thus made, and B. is called. B. is not called until there is a vacancy. At present, under our system, it is always known that at the end of three years there must be a vacancy, and that the pastor who has completed that period must be removed and appointed to fill another vacancy. But if all limitations of time were removed from the rule, and the appointments were made annually, there could be no vacancy until the meeting of the Conference, and no *necessary* vacancy then. And where a minister *might* remain, and yet it is understood during the year that he *must* leave, the results in most instances would be injurious. The Bishops could not foreknow what places they would have to fill, nor what ministers they would be obliged to station. For the mere rumor in other denominations that a pastor must go, often makes it certain that he cannot go without a great disturbance.

3. This appears more clearly from the fact that the membership of the Church, instead of, as now, having every motive to seek peace, would, in cases where, justly or unjustly, the preacher is disliked, have every motive to oppose him. Because they would perceive the *possibility* of his being re-appointed for an indefinite period, and unless there was decided opposition they would consider such successive re-appointments probable. To oppose him would be the only means of securing his removal.

It must be conceded that some now remain three years who should be transferred at the end of one or two. And this is an evil. But it is much less than the damage which would be caused by the disturbances resulting from the agitation and opposition which would then arise. Many of the best men do not make a very favorable impression at first. The people are somewhat disappointed. He is a stranger; they have not learned his ways, nor he theirs; he cannot seem as cordial and near to them, on arriving, as his predecessor, if beloved, did on departing. But if left to do his work in his own way, as the middle of the second year approaches his consistent deportment, ministrations in the pulpit, the sick-room, at the house of mourning, or his faithful pastoral visiting, have made a deep and general impression.

A genuine revival of religion crowns his labors with success, and at the end of the second year there is a unanimous desire for his return. But this class of men, before their qualities could be displayed, would be so opposed by those who were not pleased with them, or positively disliked them, that success would be made impossible. Some very singular things have been published on this subject, of which the following is an illustration :

I regard a first year's pastorate as necessarily experimental. There are few cases in which fitness can be determined before trial. The first year ought always, I think, to be experimental; and it ought not to be a hardship for any man or any Church to try again, to try several times. If we could get rid of triennialism, there would doubtless be more changes than now, because there would be more one-year terms. I have heard an old minister say, that out of twenty charges he had filled in forty-eight years of service, only two had been perfect fits.

On this suggestive passage two or three remarks may be made. It is clear that those who advocate the removal of the limitation perceive that its natural tendency would be to increase greatly the number of removals at the end of the first year; and it is certain that very many who, if they could be allowed to pursue their work quietly, would succeed finely in two or three years, would be removed at the end of the first under the suspicion, if not the brand, of failure. Many preachers, knowing that the Church had no longer the same motive to bear with them, would be tempted to concentrate their efforts wholly on securing that kind of popularity which would enable them to return. Perhaps the "old minister" who had but "two perfect fits" in his own judgment, and eighteen "misfits," was not the most competent judge. Some close observers might have classed the two with the eighteen, or called many of the latter "fits." Certain it is that many a faithful minister has done his best work where both he and the people for some time thought the appointment a "misfit." There are other considerations bearing on this point which cannot properly be omitted from the estimate. The opportunities for merited promotion would be much less than they now are. If a pastor were succeeding finely in a small place it would be indelicate for him to ask to be removed to a larger field, and if he did it secretly, while seeming to be pleased, it would involve

a species of duplicity. If it were proposed to remove him the feelings of the people would be wounded, for they would know that he preferred to go. Instances can be recalled in all parts of the country where a wound that has never healed was made by a pastor's preparing to leave a station where he was greatly beloved, at the end of a first or second year, to go to another with larger salary and real or supposed higher social position. But as it now is, at the end of a third year he must be removed, and, there being a vacancy for him, he can be placed where his abilities will have full scope, still retaining the undiminished regard of the people he leaves. Again, much jealousy and discord would arise between the Societies from the attempts of Churches to allure successful men away. Recently a prominent Church under the settled system received the report of its "Committee to secure a Pastor." The report stated that they had visited upward of forty churches, listening to ministers, and it appeared that finally they had dislodged a young man who was having great success in a large town at some distance from the city. In his letter of acceptance he speaks of "coming out of the shade into the sunlight." The only way a Church about to change could do, would be to invite some successful man, to the great sorrow of his people. When such things are done under the present limitation, generally, though not always, the invitation given, to be confirmed at the Conference, has respect to the expiration of the constitutional term. Also there are few men, if it were known that they *might* stay, who could not make it difficult to dislodge them; their friends, many or few, would sympathize with them, and much friction and loss would result. We learn, from the observation of other denominations, that the average man in the average place cannot with success remain more than two or three years; and as the average man is and will be as twenty to one in the Church, and as many very able men intellectually are only average men in ministerial and pastoral efficiency, the loss of harmony and satisfactory work caused by the attempt of average men to stay more than three years would be much greater in the Church, as a whole, than the gain made possible by the superior facilities given to a small minority.

4. The history of the introduction of the time limit confirms all that has been set forth. Francis Asbury, an unyielding

man, who showed himself ready to see the infant Church sun-dered rather than yield the claim to all the prerogatives of Wesley, was, as we saw in the beginning, unable to move the Presiding Elders as he wished until the time-limit was enacted. And he was equally unable to move the more influential preachers at the end of one, or even of two, years. An amazing, though, no doubt, unintentional, misrepresentation of the early history of American Methodism and of the Methodist Episcopal Church has been put forth by the "Brooklyn Society for the Promotion of a More Effective Working of the Methodist Itineracy:"

Up to 1804 the pastorates were all short—shorter than now; but they were made so by a judgment annually exercised by those who made them. We are quite willing that the pastorates should be short, provided that they be made short by the judgment which annually fixes them.

In 1804 the pastoral limit was fixed at two years of continuous service, and this limit was in the law for sixty years. Since 1864 the limit has been set at three years. I ask you to notice that the men who fixed upon two years in 1804 were large-minded, and set the mark up to the highest demand of any Church under their care. Two years' pastorates in 1804 met the extremest city want. If a General Conference were now to imitate the men of 1804, it could not fix the limit short of ten years. John-street, in 1804, was provided with a pastoral term up to its largest ambition; no one remembering all the changes that have occurred would think of a less term than ten years if he wished to meet the largest ambition of St. Paul's in 1880.—P. 18.

Nearly every statement in that passage is incorrect. "Up to 1804 the pastorates were all short, shorter than now." This is not correct. "Two years' pastorates in 1804 met the extremest city want." This is an error. "John-street, in 1804, was provided with a pastoral term up to its largest ambition." This is wholly wrong. Joining issue so positively on these statements, it behooves the writer to furnish irrefutable proof of the errors charged, or submit to be convicted of assailing the accuracy of another's affirmations without due care and candor. The facts are that, though for some time previous to 1794 the general custom had been for the preachers to change every six months, (albeit this was only required "when convenient,") * between

* Foot-note, Minutes, 1794: N. B.—"The Bishop and Conferences desire that the preachers would generally change every six months, by order of the Presiding Elder, whenever it can be made convenient."

1794 and 1804 the terms greatly lengthened. Many remained *two* years, and several stayed *three* years, and Francis Asbury *could not* prevent it. The proof of these statements is as follows :

1. The Annual Minutes for the years between 1794 and 1804. These show many appointments for two years, and several for three—*John-street* and Baltimore, among others, having had pastors appointed for *three successive* years.

2. Stevens' "History of the Methodist Episcopal Church," vol. iv, p. 178 :

They were not allowed to appoint preachers for more than two successive years to the same appointment; hitherto there had been no restriction, and some had been *three* years in one appointment. Asbury rejoiced in the new rule as a *great relief* to the *appointing power*.

3. Dr. Stevens is generally thoroughly reliable ; but for details it is well to go to primary sources. Jesse Lee's "History of the Methodists" was published in 1810. He says, pp. 298, 299 : "The following rule was also formed, 'The Bishop shall not allow any preacher to remain in the same station or circuit more than two years successively.' In some cases, prior to that rule, the Bishop had appointed a preacher or preachers to the same place for three years together. He now determined on a better plan, and formed this rule to prevent any preacher from wishing or expecting such an appointment in future."

The rule was not, therefore, formed to give a few stations "a pastoral term up to their largest ambition," but to render such a thing impossible. And the conclusion is, that if the iron hand of Asbury, when the Churches were weak and the discipline strong, could not maintain the itineracy without a time limitation, it is certain that, considering all the changes that have transpired, if the limitation by law were removed, the itineracy would at once and forever break down. When the proposition was first presented to the mind of the writer several years ago, in connection with the great embarrassments of a few Churches, it seemed quite plausible. But after pursuing that course which alone can lead to a safe conclusion, namely, to re-read the history of the denomination and submit the theory to unprejudiced analysis, he has been led irresistibly to the conviction that the proposition is impracticable, and that its adoption would

prove fatal to the Denomination as an organic unity in harmonious action. It is for these reasons that he feels obliged reluctantly to take issue with those who advocate this proposition, some of whom have been as useful to the Methodist Episcopal Church as he can ever hope to be.

It is also clear to his mind that to substitute four or five years for three would be open to grave objections; the most serious of which would be that it would make unnecessary removals at the end of the first year, and that many who ought to be transferred at the end of two or three would make it a matter of honor to stay for four or five. But he by no means despairs of all modification whereby occasional highly important exceptions may be provided for without overthrowing the general law.

Under the present system a pastor may return for a second term of three years in every six. This has not yet been tried on any large scale. And it certainly requires great caution. But it is a possibility, with its peculiar advantages and disadvantages, under the existing plan. However, it is obvious that in the most pressing cases it could afford but little relief, and in many none at all.

In conclusion, the writer will suggest an amendment to the rule for the consideration of those who desire some modification and yet would rather things should remain as they are than to jeopard the inestimable advantages guaranteed by the itineracy.

A POSSIBLE AMENDMENT.

Methodism has now spread to "earth's remotest bounds," and the author has recently received from Melbourne, Australia, a copy of the "Spectator" of July 25, 1879, from the editorial page of which the following is taken:

"The last Conference appointed a committee 'to prepare a report bearing on the itinerant system of Methodism, with a view to a modification of the present triennial period.' The committee has met, and nothing, of course, can be officially known as to the result of its deliberations until its report is laid before the next financial district meetings. But it is understood that it recommends the present maximum term of three years to be lengthened to six years. The appointments are to be annual, as at present, and the modification is guarded by the

provision that no appointment beyond the present limit of three years is to be made except by a two thirds vote of the Conference, and on a request sustained by a two thirds majority of the Quarterly Meeting. Thus, a minority of one third in the Conference or in the Quarterly Meeting will have an absolute veto; and the present term can only be exceeded when the reasons for it are so strong as to make both the circuit concerned and the Conference practically unanimous. The change proposed, therefore, is of only homœopathic proportions, and is fenced by such guards as may soothe the apprehensions of the most timid. How this change can be carried into effect is a question for lawyers to decide. An Act of Parliament, possibly of the Imperial Parliament, will be required; and it must take the form of an Enabling Act—an Act, that is, which will enable trustees to vary the condition of their trust so as to permit the appointment of a minister beyond the present limits. The change, therefore, even if decided upon by Conference and sanctioned by Parliament, will only take effect, as it *ought* only to take effect, in the exact degree in which the Church desires it."

This proposition has these essential advantages:

1. The itineracy is still "limited by law."
2. It is so protected that it must be *exceptional*. It would be better to make the rule three fourths of the Quarterly Conference instead of two thirds. Then the proposal for an improper case would seldom or never pass beyond that meeting. But if it did the Annual Conference could and would check it.
3. It should be so arranged as to read the Bishop "*may* appoint." Then there would be no pressure upon the free action of the appointing power, and the exception would be analogous to others.
4. It would compel influential congregations to show a little more respect to the Annual Conferences than they sometimes do. Secure in their power to obtain transfers, they have been known to isolate themselves almost entirely. But if a vote of two thirds of the Annual Conference were a pre-requisite to the retention of a pastor whom their exigencies rendered necessary to them, they would cultivate closer relations than they think important now. Such power given to the Annual Conferences would not be an innovation, as we have at present in the Discipline the following grants from the General Confer-

ence: "And also, *when requested* by an Annual Conference, to appoint a preacher for a longer time than three years to any seminary of learning not under our care;" also, "He shall have authority, *when requested* by an Annual Conference, to appoint" agents, etc. See *Discipline* of 1876, pp. 102, 103.

If some, on being refused, were to secede with their pastor, their fate in attempting to stand alone would soon work a cure. There is, however, no necessity for great haste. It is desirable to provide for exceptional cases. It would be better not to attempt it than to jeopard the wonderful and complex mechanism which we now possess. This plan, which comes from the "ends of the earth," may be feasible. Let it be thoroughly considered. For in some such direction as this, if at all, must relief be obtained.

NOTES TO EDITOR IN REGARD TO THE OLD HYMN BOOK

MR. EDITOR: The review of "The Revised Methodist Hymnal," by Dr. Wheatley, in the July issue of the *METHODIST QUARTERLY*, did not meet the eye of the writer until recently, which may explain the delay in sending you the following notice of some of the errors into which the reviewer has fallen.

Referring to the former alterations of the Hymn Book, Dr. Wheatley says: "The fifth revision, though nominally the joint work of the Revs. D. Dailey, J. B. Alverson, J. Floy, D. Patten, Jun., and F. Merrick, with whom were associated Messrs. R. A. West and D. Creamer, was mainly the product of Dr. Floy's tireless energy and assiduous application."

The completed volume, in allusion to Dr. Floy, is said to have left "his hands," and it is designated as "Floy's revision," and "Floy's version"! On what ground rests this bold assumption? Did Dr. Floy himself aspire to any such distinction above his *confrères*? Does Dr. Wheatley profess to speak from personal knowledge? The whole force of his words is in their truthfulness.

What are the facts relative to the method that was pursued in the "fifth revision" of the Hymn Book? The General Conference of 1848 appointed a committee of seven persons, whose names are given above by Dr. Wheatley, for the accomplishment of that work, in connection with certain other agencies referred to subsequently.

After the adjournment of the General Conference the Hymn-Book Committee at once entered earnestly upon their labors in the city of New York, where all their meetings were held, and Dr. Floy and Mr. West, who resided in that city, were appointed a subcommittee to act as secretaries. Their duties embraced whatever legitimately belonged to the revision and was matter of record, as correspondence, (which was very extensive,) arrangement of the hymns chosen by the Committee according to an adopted plan, and correcting the proof-sheets of the work as they came from the press.

The Committee had three sessions, and nine meetings at each session, making twenty-seven meetings in all, in the course of which the old book was examined throughout three times, and a separate vote was taken upon every hymn before it was admitted into the revised version. There were six members, out of seven, present at every meeting of the Committee.

Besides the labor expended in committee, much more was accomplished by the members at their homes; and Dr. Floy probably traveled considerably in visiting various libraries in pursuit of his portion of the work. He thus spent several days in the library of the writer, at Baltimore, which were industriously devoted by both of us to the selection of hymns for the revised book; where, twenty-nine years afterward, in 1877, Dr. Wentworth spent nearly two weeks in a similar employment with the writer and his son.

Professor Merrick, who attended only the first session of the Committee, comprising three days and nine sittings, compensated for his absence from the subsequent meetings by sending to the Committee at its second session a valuable manuscript criticism upon the whole book to be revised, which was carefully consulted both in committee and by the several members thereof. There were also similar criticisms forwarded to the Committee by outside parties, from which much useful information was derived.

The distant members of the Committee were in constant correspondence with the subcommittee or secretaries, and no new hymns, as in the case of the old ones, was allowed to be entered into the revised book until it had received the approval of a majority of the Committee. And it is but fair to assert that every member thereof has left his impress upon that work.

Within a year from their appointment, the Committee having completed their labors, in accordance with the directions of the General Conference, submitted their work to the Book Commit-

tee and the Editors of the Book Concern, for their joint examination and revision; and having been approved by them, it was presented to the Bishops "for a final review," which they gave to it, and then cordially recommended the new book to the patronage and adoption of the Church.

The above is a very brief and inadequate detail of the manner in which "the fifth revision" of the Hymn Book was accomplished; from which I infer that it was not the work of any single pair of hands, nor, indeed, entirely of the seven pairs of the whole Committee, but the joint production of the Hymn-Book Committee, the Book Committee, the Editors of the Book Concern, and the Bishops of the Church. And it can no more, with propriety, be designated as the sole work of Dr. Floy than the new "Hymnal" can be characterized as the individual production of Dr. Wentworth or Dr. Rice; the relation of these gentlemen to the Committee of fifteen being similar to that of Dr. Floy and Mr. West to the former and smaller Committee of seven.

More than thirty years have elapsed since the publication of the Hymn Book of 1849, a longer period than the Church has awarded to the use of any other of its hymnals, and an unequivocal testimony of its true merits; during which interval five of the seven brethren who composed the Committee have taken their departure from earth, leaving only Dr. Merrick and myself to tell the story of "the fifth revision." But as Dr. M. was not present at the second and third sessions of the Committee, it seems eminently proper that the writer should give to the Church and the world this correction of the dubious statement of the reviewer of the new Hymnal.

DAVID CREAMER.

BALTIMORE, December 7, 1859.

DR. WHEATLEY'S REPLY.

REV. DR. WHEDON: Mr. Creamer's communication calls in question a statement I never made, namely, that Dr. Floy was the sole author of the fifth revision. It does not affect the statement that Dr. Floy was the principal factor of that production. The authorities for that statement are as follows: 1. Dr. Floy's own hymn book, in the margin of which are entries in his own handwriting, stating that such and such alterations, etc., were made by his sole authority. 2. The statement of Rev. J. Longking, who was printer at the time, that Dr. Floy transposed hymns, altered meters, etc., while the book was passing through the press, and that he did this without the concurrent aid of the

Committee. 3. The statement of Dr. Curry, who, as an intimate friend of Dr. Floy, regards the fifth revision as the noblest monument to the memory of that gifted man. 4. Repeated statements made by ministers and laymen to the effect that Dr. Floy was the principal and most efficient agent in the construction of the last revision.

My article does not deny the efficient co-operation of Brother Creamer and of the other members of the Committee. It simply presents Dr. Floy as the leading member of that Committee; and, for the sake of convenience, speaks of the fifth as "Dr. Floy's revision" of the Hymn Book.

R. WHEATLEY.

805 BROADWAY, N. Y., December 11, 1879.

ART. VIII.—SYNOPSIS OF THE QUARTERLIES AND OTHERS OF THE HIGHER PERIODICALS.

American Reviews.

BAPTIST REVIEW, July, August, September, 1879. (Cincinnati).—1. God and the Bibles; by Prof. G. D. B. Pepper, D.D. 2. An Exposition of Genesis vi, 3; by Rev. J. F. Morton. 3. An Introduction to the Book of Isaiah; by Rev. Thos. D. Anderson, Jun. 4. Theism Grounded in Mind; by Hon. James M. Hoyt, LL.D. 5. Reason's Sphere in Things Revealed; by Rev. I. N. Carman. 6. The Foundation and the Keys: Exegesis of Matthew xvi, 18, 19; by Rev. S. W. Culver. 7. The Belief of the Hebrews in the Immortality of the Soul; translated from the French of M. Gregoire by Rev. W. H. H. Marsh. 8. The Portraiture of Jesus; by W. N. Clarke, D.D.

BIBLIOTHECA SACRA, October, 1879. (Andover).—1. The Angel of Jehovah; by Prof. C. Goodspeed. 2. Notes on Grotius' Defense; by Rev. Frank F. Hoster. 3. Bible Illustrations from Bible Lands; by Rev. Thomas Laurie, D.D. 4. The Last Days of Christ: Exegetical Notes on the Basis of Mark xiv, 17-xvi, 20; by the late Rev. Horatio B. Hackett, D.D., LL.D. 5. Relations of the Aryan and Semitic Languages; by Rev. J. F. M'Curdy, Ph.D. 6. An Essay in Systematic Theology; by Rev. George T. Ladd. 7. The Sabbath Under the Old Dispensation; by Rev. William De Loss Love, D.D. 8. Theological Education.

LUTHERAN QUARTERLY, October, 1879. (Gettysburg).—1. Church Orders; or, The Necessity of a Right Call to the Office of the Ministry; by L. A. Gotwald, D.D. 2. Home Mission and Church Extension Work Among Lutherans, Especially in the Great North-west; by S. W. Harkey, D.D. 3. Qualifications for the Gospel Ministry; by Rev. P. Born. 4. The Annihilation Theory Briefly Examined; by Rev. D. M. Gilbert, A.M. 5. Aspiration and Perspiration; by M. Valentine, D.D.

NEW ENGLANDER, November, 1879. (New Haven).—1. Needed Improvements in Public Worship; by Rev. George Harris. 2. The Rise of an Orthodox Socialism in Germany: by M. Laveleye, translated by James F. Colby, A.M. 3. Modern Education: its Opportunities and its Perils; by President Noah Porter. 4. Some Perplexities of Thought; by Rev. Jotham Sewall, Jun. 5. Shall the Church rely on Revivalism or on Christian Nurture? by Rev. William B. Clarke. 6. The Baccanian Influence in Religion; by Prof. H. M. Whitney. 7. Language and the Egyptian Language; by Dr. Carl Abel, translated by Poultney Bigelow. 8. The Mystery of Free-Will—where to find it; by Prof. Lemuel S. Potwin.

NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, November, 1879. (New York.)—1. The Other Side of the Woman Question; by Julia Ward Howe, Thomas Wentworth Higginson, Lucy Stone, Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Wendell Phillips. 2. Malthusianism, Darwinism, and Pessimism; by Professor Francis Bowen. 3. A Page of Political Correspondence: Stanton to Buchanan. 4. The Diary of a Public Man. Part IV. 5. Tariff Reactions; by Professor Arthur L. Perry. 6. Some Recent Works of Fiction; by Edward Eggleston.

December, 1879.—1. Romanism and the Irish Race in the United States. Part I; by James Anthony Froude. 2. Young Men in Politics; by George S. Boutwell. 3. The Religion of To-day. 4. Is Political Economy a Science? by Professor Bonamy Price. 5. English and American Physique; by Geo. M. Beard. 6. The Permanence of Political Forces. Part I; by Cuthbert Mills.

Professor Bowen's article on Malthusianism, Darwinism, and Pessimism, is a production of special value. It opens some veins of thought, brings them into fresh combination, and educes and suggests conclusions, both doctrinal and practical, of most momentous importance.

Malthusianism and Darwinism (with an occult assumption of Atheism) are the twin premises of which Pessimism is the conclusion; and Pessimism is the ruin of our race. Both Malthusianism and Darwinism are based upon the idea of *over-population*: the former of the human race, and the latter of the animal races. Both doctrines require the suppression of life as a safety-valve; and from both demonstrate the *worthlessness of life*, human as well as animal. If life is worthless, then suicide is innocent and murder a trifle. Before us, then, is the abyss!

WHAT IS MALTHUSIANISM?

In order to refute the doctrines of human perfectibility taught by Rousseau and Condorcet, which taught the coming of an age of peace, virtue, and happiness over the earth by natural development, the Rev. T. R. Malthus published in 1798 his "Essay on Population; or, a View of its Past and Present Effects on Human Happiness." This book for the first time threw the awful shadow of over-population before the eyes of mankind as the fatal terminus in the way of all not only perfectibility, but great permanent improvement. The more peaceful, virtuous, prosperous, and growing the community or the nations, the nearer and surer the result. The more science, charity, good morals increased, the more rapid the ruin. The only angels of redemption against this dire terminus were celibacies, suppressions of life, wars, pestilences, and famines.

For the law is common to the vegetable and animal kingdoms, the human race included, that the rate of increase, however slow

or rapid it may be, must operate in the way of a geometrical ratio. The same causes which double a population of one thousand will double a population of one thousand millions. For example: a given rate of increase between 1790 and 1800 added only 1,200,000 to the white population of this country; between 1830 and 1840 *the same rate* of increase added 3,600,000. Our population was more than doubled between 1790 and 1820; it was again more than doubled between 1820 and 1850. But the former doubling added less than five millions to our numbers, while the latter one added over ten millions; and the next doubling, in 1880, will have added considerably more than twenty millions. Inevitably then, if the population increase at all, it must increase in the way of a geometrical progression—that is, as the numbers 1, 2, 4, 8, 16, etc.

But the means of subsistence, at best, cannot possibly be made to increase faster than in an arithmetical ratio—that is, as the numbers 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, etc. The surface of the earth affords only a limited extent of ground, and this is of various degrees of fertility, large portions of it being hardly cultivable at all. By putting more ground in cultivation and improving the modes of agriculture, it is conceivable that, within twenty-five years, the quantity of food should be doubled. But it is not conceivable that *more* than this should be accomplished; that is, that the second twenty-five years should make a *larger* addition to the existing stock than was obtained during the former period. Hence, under the most favorable supposition that can be made, beginning with an annual product equal to one million bushels of wheat, at the end of the first quarter of a century this might be raised to two millions, at the end of the second quarter to three millions, and at the close of the third period to four millions.—Pp. 448, 449.

ADOPTION OF THE DOCTRINE AND ITS RESULTS.

The inferences from this theory were logically of the most inhumane character. If the increase of life was the great danger, all humanitarianism was essentially criminal. Charity was a folly. Vaccination was the enemy, and small-pox the benefactor. Marriage and fecundity were crimes against the public welfare. These conclusions were, of course, welcome to the English aristocracy, both as refuting the revolutionary doctrines and as relieving them of all responsibility for the miseries of the lower classes. Political economy was, down to a late period, based on Malthusianism. "These opinions led to the enactment, in 1834, of the New Poor Law, the avowed purpose of which was to prevent what is called 'outdoor relief,' and to collect the destitute and starving in union work-houses, where, as in jails, the separation of the sexes, the lowness of the diet,

and the general severity of the regimen, should be a terror to the evil-doers who had presumed to burden society with their superfluous progeny. If the crime was not literally theirs, it was at any rate their parents' fault, and the sins of the fathers must be visited upon the children in order to deter others from like offenses. 'Go to the work-house, or starve,' was henceforth to be the answer to all applicants for parochial relief; and the reader of Dickens need not be reminded that many of them preferred the latter alternative."—P. 450.

ITS PRACTICAL REFUTATION.

As Malthusianism is a signal instance showing how a dogma may demoralize a people, so its refutation, brought about by its effects, shows how a fact may demolish a dogma.

But the triumph of Malthusianism lasted only for about half a century, and its decline and fall have been even more rapid than its rise. The tide turned about the time of the famine in Ireland in 1846-47, and the consequent fearful exodus from that unhappy island, which, in less than ten years, deprived it of full one fourth of its population. In 1845 the number of persons in that country was estimated at 8,295,000, and they were increasing with considerable rapidity. In 1851 the population was only 6,574,278; and in 1871 it was less than five and one half millions, being a diminution of nearly thirty-five per cent. The Malthusians themselves were appalled at such a result. For the evil did not stop with the immediate diminution of numbers; as usual, in such cases, it was chiefly those who were in the flower of life, the healthy and the strong, who emigrated, leaving behind them the aged, the feeble, and the diseased. Hence the people at home deteriorated in vitality and working power even in a higher ratio than their decrease in numbers. At the same period there was also a great emigration, though by no means to an equivalent extent, from England, and especially from Scotland, where the great land-owners had acted on Malthusian principles by depopulating their vast estates, unroofing the cottages over their tenants' heads, and thus compelling them to ship themselves beyond sea. Then came the great trials of the Crimean war and the Indian mutiny, with the attendant difficulty of recruiting the army, so that the country awoke to a knowledge of the sad truth that, in banishing their people, they were drying up the sources of their productive power and their military strength.—Pp. 451, 452.

TRUE LAWS OF FECUNDITY.

The discussion brings out some interesting conclusions in regard to the true principles of population. The first prominent

fact of observation is that *the lower classes of life, the poor and ignorant, are very prolific, while the higher classes, the rich, intellectual, and aristocratic, tend to sterility.* As men rise in culture and in varied means of enjoyment, they resort less to animal gratifications. The very poor have scarce any other.

On examining the facts in the case more closely, it will always be found that it is not the excess of population which causes the misery, but the misery which causes the excess of population. Hopeless poverty makes men imprudent and reckless, and leads them to burden themselves with a family because they cannot be worse off, and there is no possibility of improving their condition. In Switzerland, where the land is parceled out among small proprietors, the peasantry obtain a comfortable livelihood, and, therefore, increase so slowly that the population will not double itself in less than two hundred and twenty-seven years. In France, where also the land is cut up into very small estates, and the peasantry are vastly better off than in England, the rate of increase for the population for ten years is only five per cent. In England, for the same period, it was fifteen per cent. ; and in Connaught, the sink of Irish misery and degradation, between 1821 and 1831 it was as high as twenty-two per cent. In Galway and Mayo, notoriously two of the most destitute counties, during the same period, there was an increase in the one case of twenty-seven and in the other of twenty-five per cent.—nearly as great as in the United States. Thus the two extremes of general misery and general well-being produce very nearly the same effect on the movement of the population.—P. 454.

In England it is a matter of common observation that the families of the nobility and landed gentry constantly tend to die out, and, if they were not recruited by promotions from the middle classes, the upper orders of society would gradually disappear. Of the barons who sat in the English House of Lords in 1854, the peerage of considerably more than one half does not date back beyond 1800; and not more than thirty of them can boast that their ancestors were ennobled before 1711. The continued and increasing opulence of the landed gentry of England is chiefly attributable to this cause; since the diminution of their numbers tends, of course, to the concentration of their estates. Celibate or childless lives are common among the younger sons of the nobility and gentry, while they are very infrequent in the classes of artisans and laborers. Even here, in the eastern part of the United States, the sons in educated and wealthy families marry later in life, and have fewer children, than those in the classes who live by handiwork; while the Irish laborers are the most prolific of all. No further back than the beginning of this century families containing from ten to fifteen children each were not infrequent here in New England; now, one that has more than six is seldom found except among the very poor.—P. 455.

DARWINISM IS ANIMAL MALTHUSIANISM.

Darwinism is based on the same assumption of the overwhelming fecundity of animal life and the beneficence of destruction. In this battle of destruction it is the animal endowed with the best advantages for the struggle that survives and propagates his like, and so arise *species*. And so, too, result the rising of species into higher grades, for it is *the best* that survives. And as the slight variations of the new-born animals are properly *accidental*, that is, guided by no *intention*, so an air of what allow us to call *accidentality* is flung over the whole process, quite acceptable to Atheism. But here, alas, as Professor Bowen shows, comes in the true principle of fecundity that upsets this theory. In both the animal and vegetable worlds the law prevails that *low life is prolific and high life is chary of over-propagation*. Insects and fishes propagate by billions and trillions, but mammals by half dozens. It is by this secret principle of superior fecundity in animal life that species survive, and not by any slight individual accidental advantage, which is sure to be obliterated in a generation or two, that species prevail. "Natural selection," therefore, is a fallacy. And when art steps in and arbitrarily selects, art can improve, can vary wonderfully sometimes, and fantastically even, but the new forms tend to reversion, to sterility, and are rarely permanent.

Between low life and high life there arises this remarkable conservative balance, that the former is protected by its numbers and the latter by its strength. And if a battle between the two can be imagined, the low would be most likely to conquer, and the unfittest to survive. The Professor piquantly says :

If a battle of this sort were possible, victory in it would not depend on superiority of organization. The existence not of the lower races, but of the higher ones, would be imperiled. We can foresee this result in our own case, whether we compare the different classes of human society with each other, or man himself, the order primates, with the inferior animals. In the grand "struggles" which will occur about the time of the Greek Kalendar, the primitive stocks, such as Irish bog-trotters and Welsh peasants, would certainly "survive" the nobility and gentry, though the latter profit by the accumulated advantages of high breeding transmitted by direct inheritance through a pedigree extending back to William the Conqueror. And, in the final

stage of the conflict even these original poor representatives of humanity must die out long before some of the animals far below them. Those pests of our summer, the insect tribes, would sing the requiem of man, and feast on his remains. Accordingly, the only original and distinctive feature of Darwinism—its attempt to explain away the argument from design for the being of a God by showing that the supposed adaptations of means to ends, and the admirably complex arrangements by which every portion of a living organism is fitted to do its proper work, may all be accounted for by the blind and unconscious action of mechanical principles and physical laws, without calling in anywhere a Divine purpose or a contriving Mind—must be regarded as a baseless hypothesis. A careful study of the successive development of the higher forms of life upon the earth does not invalidate, but fully confirms, the doctrine which has been held by every great thinker, from Socrates down to the present day, that no organism could have been produced without an organizing mind.—P. 462.

PESSIMISM.

Seen under the desperation of Malthus and the accidentalism of Darwin, deprived of all the lights and colorings of a higher faith, the universe is a dismal presentation, and daguerreotypes itself on the predisposed mind as Pessimism. Life is worthless. Man is a lump of matter crowded into a certain shape by a concurrence of blind forces, stimulated by a force called *life*, with certain molecular motions in his upper end called *thought*. Shatter the lump, and the molecular motion stops; and what of it? Just as well as if it kept a-going. My life is worthless; your life is worthless. All moralities are dissolved, and crime is just as good as innocence. And the more sincere these views, the worse they are, and the more dangerous the men who hold them. "Educated men, who have come to regard their own lives as only a burden to them, though they have been driven to despair, not by the privations and miseries which afflict the hopelessly poor, but by an insensate theory which teaches them to consider the existence of the human race itself as an intolerable evil, that can be abated most effectually by reducing society to anarchy and ruin, and who have prepared themselves for the admission of this theory by getting rid of all the restraints of morality and religion—these are foes truly formidable, against whom all the precautions and means of defense which governments can institute seem to be of little avail. This is the real ground of the terror recently inspired by the

Nihilists in Russia and by the leaders of what is called 'the social democracy' in Germany."

Such is the anarchic abyss before us. To its brink we are led by Darwinism and Haeckelism. And the only remedy we have against it is the earnest hope of immortality, the powerful revival of Christian faith.

AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW, October, 1879. (Philadelphia.)—1. The Canadian Element in the United States; by J. G. Shea, LL.D. 2. Modern and Ancient Philosophy Compared; by Rev. J. Ming, S. J. 3. De La Salle: His Life and Work; by M. O'R. 4. Recent Progress in Stellar Physics; by Rev. J. M. Degni, S. J. 5. The Mormons; by General John Gibbon, U. S. A. 6. The Internal Condition of Russia; by A. de G. 7. Cardinal Pole; by Rev. M. J. M'Loughlin. 8. The Recent Encyclical Letter of Pope Leo XIII.; by Very Rev. James A. Corcoran, D.D.

Our graceful and scholarly Roman contemporary contains the *Epistola Encyclica* of Pope Leo, commending St. Thomas Aquinas to the faith of the Church. We suppose this pre-eminence is justly due to St. Thomas as being the greatest theologian of the Middle Ages, and among the greatest intellects of any age. He is so indorsed now by infallibility that his works appear to be endowed with an intrinsic infallible authority, and his words, like those of Trent, may be safely quoted as a binding authority. And perhaps this *infallibilizing* process is now performed to secure the theology of the Church against any future disturbing vagary of the infallible spokesman, and make all firm. It may be a surprise to some that he is placed above Augustine; a fact, perhaps, in some measure due to Augustine's predestinarianism. For, great as Augustine's authority was, his fatalisms were never accepted, as is generally assumed they were, by the Western Church. The creed of Trent is not Augustinian. The Church doctors, in refuting the Jansenists, were greatly embarrassed by the authority of Augustine.

The following is a Jubilate for our Yankee brethren:

Meanwhile Catholic Canada is sending her Catholic sons, her priests, her devoted sisterhoods, into this country. New England, which sought with such rabid hate to crush Canada and Canadian Catholicity, now sees her towns swarm with Canadian Catholics, with churches and convents. Did the early Cottons, and Mathers, and Endicotts, and Winthrops ever dream of such a result? Did they foresee that when their stern unchristian Calvinism had given place to Unitarianism there would be seventy thousand Canadian Catholics in Massachusetts, thirteen thousand in New Hampshire, more than twice as many in the New Hampshire

Grants, ten thousand in Rhode Island, and as many in Connecticut, and twenty-six thousand in the district of Maine, living their Canadian life, with church, and priest, and nun, reproducing that hated province on that New England soil which they sought to separate by a wall of fire from all dissent? Catholics of other lands there would be in their eyes bad enough; the despised Irish Catholics bad, very bad; Catholics of New England lineage, and many there be, horrible enough; but nothing, we think, would have curdled the blood of those New England worthies of the early part of last century more than the mere suggestion of the possibility that the day would come when one hundred and fifty thousand Canadian Catholics would quietly seat themselves on the sacred soil of New England!—P. 604.

English Reviews.

BRITISH AND FOREIGN EVANGELICAL REVIEW, October, 1879. (London.)—1. J. T. Beck of Tübingen; by R. W. Barbour. 2. Michael Bruce *versus* John Logan; by the Rev. R. Small. 3. The Rule of Righteousness. 4. The Day of Our Lord's Last Supper; by the Rev. George Brown. 5. The Canadian North-west and the Gospel; by George Patterson, D.D. 6. The Historical Personality of Christ in the Four Gospels; by A. N. Macnicoll. 7. Muhammadan Exegesis of the Qurán and Traditions; by the Rev. Edward Sell. 8. The Controversy Between John Welsh and Gilbert Brown in 1598; or "Where was the Protestant Religion before Luther?" by the Rev. W. Irwin. 9. Review of Recent Literature on the Criticism and Interpretation of the New Testament; by the Rev. Professor Salmond.

BRITISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, October, 1879. (London.)—1. Adolphe Monod: A Biographical Sketch. 2. Irenæus; His Testimony to Early Conceptions of Christianity. 3. Dr. Johnson. 4. The Vatican and Civilization. 5. What is Religion? 6. Political Prospects of Italy. 7. University Education in Ireland.

EDINBURGH REVIEW, October, 1879. (New York.)—1. Germany since the Peace of Frankfort. 2. Mozart. 3. The Philosophy of Color. 4. Spedding's Life of Bacon. 5. The Civil Engineers of Britain. 6. The Family of Mirabeau. 7. Froude's *Cæsar*. 8. The Code of Criminal Law. 9. Impressions of Theophrastus Such. 10. Afghanistan.

LONDON QUARTERLY REVIEW, October, 1879. (London.)—1. Prophecies Concerning Israel after the Captivity. 2. The English Church in the Eighteenth Century. 3. Ladies' Work among the Poor. 4. The Ancient British Church. 5. Dr. Eadie. 6. Colenso's Last Volume and Supernatural Religion. 7. The Evangelical Alliance at Basle.

LONDON QUARTERLY REVIEW, October, 1879. (New York.)—1. Pascal and his Editors. 2. The College of Physicians. 3. Albert Dürer. 4. The Founder of Norwich Cathedral. 5. Joseph de Maistre on Russia. 6. Froude's *Cæsar*. 7. The Weather and its Predictions. 8. Henry IV. of France. 9. The Submission of the Clergy. 10. Principles at Stake.

WESTMINSTER REVIEW, October, 1879. (New York.)—1. The Federation of the English Empire. 2. The Law of Real Property. 3. The Indian Mutiny. 4. Cavour and Lamarmora. 5. The Bohemians and Slovaks. 6. Prince Bismarck. 7. Lord Brougham. 8. India and our Colonial Empire.

German Reviews.

THEOLOGISCHE STUDIEN UND KRITIKEN. (Theological Essays and Reviews.) *Essays*: 1. CREMER, The Roots of Anselm's Theory of Satisfaction. 2. KAWERAU, The Outbreak of the Antinomian Controversy. 3. NÖSGEN, The Origin of the Third Gospel. *Thoughts and Remarks*: WIESELER, The Death Year of Polycarp. *Reviews*: BAUDISSIN, The Idea of Holiness in the Old Testament, reviewed by RIEHM.

An article on "the Third Gospel" gives in ninety pages a very full review of the recent German literature on the subject. Its author, C. F. Nösgen, had published in two former volumes of the *Studien und Kritiken* elaborate articles on the historical causes leading to the composition of the third Gospel, which have attracted great attention. The author argues at length that the writer of the third Gospel did not use a common source with the authors of the first and second Gospels, that his work was not a mere translation, but that it was probably based upon notes which the writer himself had made of the great events of the gospel history. He regards it as certain that this Gospel was composed prior to the destruction of Jerusalem, and rejects as entirely groundless the opinions of those who, like Köslin and Holzmann, place the time of composition about the year 80 A. D., or, like Hilgenfeld, Volkmar, and Scholten, toward the close of the first century, or even, like Keim, into the time of Hadrian, shortly before the second destruction of Jerusalem. Proofs are adduced that the third Gospel was generally known to the Churches of the East and the West at the time of Irenæus and Tertullian, and that before this time it was known to Papias and to many of the early heretics and pseudo-epigraphs. If this Gospel had been composed after the end of the first century, it might be expected that the Gnostics, who had already begun at that time to develop a great strength, would have been in some way or other referred to. The argument against the authenticity of the Gospel which Keim derives from a pretended acquaintance of the author of the third Gospel with Josephus is refuted as inconclusive. Nösgen refers to an essay published by him in a former number of the *Studien und Kritiken*, (1879, p. 521,) in which the relations between Luke and Josephus have been fully discussed by him. The similarity of certain expressions found both in Josephus and Luke is no greater than might be expected between any two writers who belonged to the same period of literature, and both whom

wrote Greek as foreigners. In regard to the author of the third Gospel Nösgen believes that the uniform belief of the ancient Church which called Luke its author is unimpeachable. For though the statements found in the Muratorian fragment, in Irenæus, in Origen, and Eusebius concerning Luke and his Gospel are regarded by him more as surmises than ecclesiastical tradition, he lays great stress on the entire unanimity of these early statements in regard to the authorship of Luke, and he considers the weight of the argument all the greater as the name of Luke is by no means prominent in the other books of the New Testament, and as the high place he now holds in the estimation of the Christian Church rests entirely on the assumption of his being the author of two books of the Sacred Canon. The author refrains from discussing the question where the Gospel of Luke was composed. He believes that there is no passage in either the third Gospel or the Acts from which any inference could be derived. The arguments which have been adduced for several towns are based upon opinions which have no scientific value. The purity of the Greek found in the third Gospel is a testimony for the writer, but allows no inference as to the place where the book was written.

ZEITSCHRIFT FÜR WISSENSCHAFTLICHE THEOLOGIE. Edited by Hilgenfeld. First Number. 1880. 1. A. HILGENFELD, The Gospel of John and the Defense of its Authenticity, by F. Godet and C. E. Luthardt. 2. FR. GÖRRES, The Pretended Persecution of Christians at the Time of the Emperors Numerianus and Carinus. 3. H. HOLTZMANN, Papias and Johannes. 4. SPATH, The Jonathan of the New Testament. 5. R. HILGENFELD, P. Sulpicius, P. F. Quirinius. *Reviews*: 1. HARNACK, The Muratorian Fragment, (1879.) 2. NÖSGEN, On Luke and Josephus, (1879.) 3. ANNULUS RUFINI, edited by Tobler.

We have referred, in our account of the new number of the *Studien und Kritiken*, to the controversy which German theologians keep up on the relations between Luke and Josephus. Several theologians of the liberal school are very positive in maintaining that Luke, both by the use of some Greek phrases peculiar to Josephus, and still more by a reference to facts which he must have taken from Josephus, shows a dependence on that writer, and that, therefore, the Gospel bearing his name must have been composed later than the works of Josephus. Among the theologians who defend this view is H. Holtzmann, Professor of Theology at the University of Strasburg, and a regular and frequent contributor to the *Zeitschrift für Wissenschaftliche Theologie*. He has explained his reasons at full length in

the volume of the *Zeitschrift* for 1877, (p. 535.) In reply to him C. F. Nösgen, the author of the above article in the *Studien und Kritiken* on Luke, wrote in the volume of the *Studien* for 1879, denying that any phrase or fact can be found in the third Gospel which can be traced with certainty to the works of Josephus. In the present number of the *Zeitschrift für Wissenschaftliche Theologie* Holtzmann replies to Nösgen. The controversy is somewhat seasoned by the flavor of personalities, each writer assuring us that he cannot discover any thing of real worth in the dissertation of his opponent. Holtzmann declares himself to have derived great pleasure from the fact that his views regarding the partial dependency of Luke upon Josephus are indorsed by some able scholars, of whom he mentions E. Rénan; the author of "Supernatural Religion," in the "Fortnightly Review," October, 1877; and W. Brückner.

In a postscript to the present number of the *Zeitschrift für Historische Theologie*, Professor Hilgenfeld indorses the opinion expressed by Th. Zahn in the *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, that the Greek original of the work of Irenæus against the heretics, and the *απομνήματα* of Hegesippus in five books, were still extant in the sixteenth century, and may yet be found. He adds that he has recently found, in an edition of the *Constitutiones Apostolorum*, by Turrianus, (De Torres,) published at Venice, in 1563, another proof that not only the work of Hegesippus, but also the *Syntagmas* of Ignatius and Hippolytus were extant at that time.

French Reviews.

- REVUE CHRETIENNE. (Christian Review.) August, 1879. 1. LEOPOLD MONOD, French Protestantism and Evangelical Missions. 2. HECTOR BERLIOZ. September, 1879.—1. G. MEYER, The Evangelization of France. 2. PRESSENSÉ, The Last Manifestations of the Naturalistic School in Literature. 3. DE RICHTMOND, La Rochelle Beyond the Sea. John Jay. 4. ROHR, Discourses Addressed to the Students of Theology at Strasburg by Professor E. Reuss. 5. DECAPPEL, The Invasion of the Locusts, Joel i and ii. October, 1879.—1. STAPPER, Review of the third volume of Havet's *Le Christianisme et Ses Origines*. Tom. iii, Judaism. 2. E. W., The Life of Charles Kingsley. 3. F. ALONE, Too Probable Not to Be True. A Novel. November, 1879.—1. PRESSENSÉ, Address on the Influence of the Christian Press made at the Eighth Ecumenical Conference of the Evangelical Alliance. 2. E. W., The Life of Charles Kingsley. 3. F. ALONE, Too Probable Not to Be True.

In France, as in the other Latin countries of Europe and America, Protestantism has been crushed by the iron hand of bigots

and tyrants, but it has secured a permanent place in the history of Protestantism. What Protestant France has done for the foreign mission cause is the subject of the very interesting article by Leopold Monod in the August number. The article was originally prepared for the *Allgemeine Missions Zeitschrift*, a German monthly, devoted to the cause of foreign Protestant missions, which in this field has hardly any superior; but as the subject is of special interest to French Protestants, it is published in the *Revue Chretienne* also. Of course, while suffering from terrible persecutions at home, and struggling for a mere existence, the Protestant Churches could not be expected to do much for the extension of Protestantism in foreign countries. How efficient the persecution was to which the Protestants were subjected may be seen from the fact that at the last enumeration of the Reformed Churches made at the national Synod of Alençon, in 1637, there still were in existence eight hundred and six Churches, with six hundred and forty-one pastors. In 1806 the number of Churches had dwindled down to one hundred and seventy-one, and of these fifty were vacant. The first French Republic ended the long persecution of Protestants, and secured to it for the future religious toleration. The first French Protestant Bible Society was founded in 1818; in the same year the first Protestant paper, the *Archives du Christianisme*, was established. In 1821 Pastor Janssen, of Geneva, published in the French language a missionary work entitled, "Description of the Present Condition of Protestant Missions in Infidel Countries," as far as it was known in the beginning of the year 1820. It produced a great effect, and in many towns appeals were made by the pastors for missionary contributions. The first contributions were sent to Basle, but in December, 1822, a Missionary Society was established at Paris. The director of the missionary institute at Basle, M. Blumhardt, urged the society to establish its own mission, and the society resolved to follow this advice. The first missionary employed was Jonas King, an American minister, who offered to work under the auspices of the society among the Moham-medans and Jews of Palestine. In 1823 this committee announced that it had secured a mission-house, which had received two pupils from Basle. From that time a rapid progress was achieved. The receipts in 1823 amounted to thirteen thousand

and sixty-one francs, in 1846 to one hundred and four thousand francs, in 1878 to two hundred and eleven thousand francs. Soon after 1846 came a great crisis, and the mission-house had to be closed for several years; but, thanks to the liberal aid furnished by the Protestants of other countries, it was reopened in 1856. It had in 1879 four students, and two others were educated in the preparatory school of Batignolles. As a condition for admission to the mission-house the academic degree of *bachelier ès lettres* is required. Auxiliary societies have been formed among women and children, but it is complained that the organization of the branch societies is not as efficient as it ought to be. The liberality of the missionary contributions considerably varies in different parts of France. The total Protestant population was given by the census of 1872 as 580,757, in a total population of 36,102,921.* At the census of 1872, which gave an entire population of 36,905,788, no inquiry was made into the religious divisions of the population. The figure given by the census of 1872 for the Protestant population is generally considered by Protestant writers as too low, and Monod, in accordance with an article on the religious statistics of France in Lichtenberger's "Encyclopædie," estimates it from 600,000 to 650,000. Dividing the Protestants of France into eight territorial groups, it has been found that the highest average contribution for foreign missions from any of these groups was ninety-two centimes for every Protestant inhabitant, the lowest ten centimes, and the average for all France twenty centimes. The number of missionaries sent out was forty-nine, of whom thirty-seven were Frenchmen. France has only one Protestant missionary journal, the *Journal des Missions*, which is sent to 1,820 persons, and has 714 paying subscribers.

Many of the Huguenots who were driven from France by

* The figure given in the census of 1872 (580,757) means the entire Protestant population, including children. Some works erroneously give it as the number of communicants, and estimate the entire Protestant population at about 1,500,000. That this is a mistake appears at once from the denominational division of the population of France given in the census, which is as follows: Catholics, 35,387,703; Protestants, 580,757; Israelites, 49,439; other non-Christian denominations, 3,071; without religion, or religion unknown, 81,951; total, 36,102,921. It will also be noticed that the author of the above article claims no higher figure than 650,000 for the entire Protestant population.

fierce persecution have risen to great distinction in other countries, especially in Prussia and the United States. The article "La Rochelle Beyond the Sea," treats especially of the fate of the Protestant exiles who are descendants of the citizens of the great stronghold of French Protestantism, La Rochelle, and gives in particular a biographical sketch of John Jay, who played a prominent part in politics in the early period of the United States, and finally was appointed Chief Justice of the United States.

In a brief article of the same number of the "Christian Review" Pressensé calls attention to the literary productions of the new chief of an ultra-materialistic school, M. Zola. "It is a disgrace of our generation," he says, "that the utterances of the materialistic school attain a fabulous number of editions." I believe that the last but one novel of M. Zola, *l'Assommoir*, has exceeded its seventieth edition. Evidently it must have the entire world for its market. The materialistic school claims to paint nature, or, more correctly, real life all naked, all crude, without any attenuation. It purports to represent the hideous sides without excluding any thing, and in a brutal language which is, as it were, a photograph of its ugliness, the cast of its monstrous excrecences. The series which has made M. Zola famous is called *Rougon-Macquart*. He makes a cynical application to humanity of the law of natural selection and heredity. He follows through all their situations the descendants of one family, and shows them carrying along a first hereditary germ which gradually develops and is modified in a terrible struggle for life which gives no room to any pure, generous sentiment, to any remonstrance of conscience. The author paints to us, with an extraordinary relief, contemporaneous life, in the country as well as in the large cities, from the court of the Emperor Napoleon III. to the tavern where the workman becomes brutalized, under the purely materialistic influence of a gross existence. It is impossible for any one who has not read *l'Assommoir* to imagine a more odious abuse of a great talent. The language, purposely vulgar, surpasses all expectations. And such works are devoured by thousands of our contemporaries! M. Zola, however, has received a striking proof of the failure of his system in an artistic point of view. He must have seen that his realism will not bear being presented to a

large assembly of men, and that it can only be relished in the solitude when one is alone to blush. When he has tried to bring *l'Assommoir* upon the stage, he has seen himself forced to come back to a quite ordinary drama, where vice is punished and virtue rewarded."

ART. IX.—FOREIGN RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE.

THE PROTESTANT CHURCHES OF GERMANY.

THE most important event in the history of the German Churches during the past year is undoubtedly the meeting of the First General Synod of the Prussian State Church. The German Churches have been for several years in a state of transition. From the Reformation until the present time they have been, on the whole, governed by the sovereigns and heads of the State, and self-government has been almost unknown. For some time there has been a steadily growing demand in all the States of Germany for the introduction of a synodal constitution, which would secure to the Churches, though not an entirely independent position, at least the right of representation, and of the co-operation of her chosen representatives with the State authorities in the administration of Church affairs. In nearly all the smaller States the synods have been in operation for several years. The greatest obstacles had to be overcome in Prussia. An extraordinary General Synod of the Churches of the old provinces (those belonging to the monarchy before the acquisition of Schleswig-Holstein) was held at Berlin in 1873, and was on all sides regarded as an event of marked importance. The plan of establishing a periodical General Synod, as a permanent institution of the Church, was generally concurred in, but the actual meeting of the first regular General Synod has been repeatedly postponed. It finally took place on October 9, 1879. It was composed of one hundred and ninety-four members, of whom one hundred and forty-nine had been elected by the provincial synods, thirty had been appointed by the King, nine were Superintendents General, and six representatives of the theological faculties of the universities. Like its predecessor, the preparatory General Synod of 1873, it represented only the Churches of the old provinces of the monarchy. The Churches in the new provinces, Schleswig-Holstein, Hanover, and Hesse-Nassau, have not yet been fully incorporated with the organism of the State Church. The religious complexion was different from that of its predecessors, and may have been a surprise to many outside of Germany, who have some vague idea of an entire relapse of the German Churches into rationalism and infidelity. In 1873 the majority of the extraordinary synod belonged to the so-called *Vermittlungspartei*, or party of mediation, which prevailed at the Prussian universities, and, as its name indicates, tried to find a middle ground be-

tween the orthodoxy of the Churches of the sixteenth century and the rationalistic schools of the present age. At present this party is in a minority, and the two parties representing the theology of the sixteenth century are in a decisive majority. These two parties are: 1. that of the *Konfessionellen*, or the strict Lutherans, who stand up for the undiminished authority of the symbolical books of the Lutheran Church, and desire to keep unimpaired the Lutheran character of that portion of the United Evangelical Church which at the time of the establishment of this Church was regarded as Lutheran; 2. that of the "Friends of the Positive Union," who claim an authoritative character only for the "consensus," or the common doctrinal points of the Lutheran and German Reformed Churches, but would allow no further latitude for liberal or rationalistic tendencies. These two parties disagree on every thing that is peculiar to strict Lutheranism, but they generally act conjointly in opposition to all propositions proceeding from the other parties. Together the two parties numbered about one hundred and twenty votes, and they therefore formed a considerable majority of the General Synod. The middle party, which has assumed the name of *Evangelische Vereinigung*, (Evangelical Association,) had about forty-nine regular members and a number of sympathizers. The adherents of the Protestant Union who hold decidedly rationalistic views constitute the insignificant party of the Left, numbering no more than eight members. The members of the high nobility, which are very numerous, belong mostly to the strict Lutheran party; among them are Herr von Kleist-Retzow and Count Krassow, the political leaders of the party; Herr von Seydewitz, the President of the German Reichstag; the Superintendent General Dr. Büchsel; the Consistorial President, Dr. Hegel, a son of the celebrated philosopher. The Friends of the Positive Union constitute the most numerous party in the House, because most of the members appointed by the King belong to it. The royal family before the establishment of the United Evangelical Church did not belong to the Lutheran, but to the Reformed Church and the personal sympathies of the present King, like those of his father and brother, the late Kings Frederic William III. and Frederic William IV., are with the party of permanent union rather than with the Lutheran party, the tendency of which is toward weakening and ultimately toward repealing the union. As some preachers of the court have obtained considerable influence in this party, it has by its opponents been sometimes called the Court Preachers' Party. The most influential man of this party is the court preacher, Dr. Kögel. Among other well-known members are the Superintendents General Dr. Wiessman, Dr. Erdmann, and Dr. Möller; Professor Gess, well known by several theological writings; Dr. Wiese, the author of a number of educational works; Count Bismarck-Bohlen, and a number of high State functionaries. The party of the Evangelical Association counts the largest number of theological writers of note; among them are the Professors Beyschlag and Dr. Köstlin, of Halle; the jurist, Dr. Hölschner; and Dr. Schrader, a distinguished writer on educational affairs.

The General Synod elected as its President, by unanimous acclamation, Count Arnim-Boyzenburg, and the election appears to have given general satisfaction. His experience in parliamentary regulations, his extensive scholarship and familiar acquaintance with all the subjects discussed, and his thorough impartiality, are acknowledged on all sides. The Vice-President, Rübsamen, who is a Superintendent in Pomerania, belongs to the Lutheran party. The present Minister of Ecclesiastical Affairs, Herr von Puttkammer, a brother-in-law of Premier Bismarck, strongly sympathizes with the orthodox majority of the General Synod, while his predecessor, Dr. Falk, was supposed to share the views of the Left, which is now but so feebly represented. The Government and the majority of the General Synod are fully agreed in desiring the restoration of the doctrines of the Reformation; they differ in regard to the position which is to be given to the claims of a strict Lutheranism. The resolutions adopted by the General Synod aim at the restoration of Protestant orthodoxy; the Lutheran question will come up for its solution at some future time.

The labors of the General Synod have been very extensive. The Supreme Ecclesiastical Council has prepared nineteen bills for discussion and adoption; besides disposing of these, the General Council passed a number of other important resolutions. Of special significance is the position which the Synod has taken with regard to the school question. The orthodox parties of the Prussian Church with great unanimity reject the principle of unsectarian schools, and favor the denominational character of the public schools. The General Synod has declared itself very emphatically in favor of a close connection between the State schools and those Churches which the State recognizes. Minister Puttkammer has publicly declared his concurrence in these views, and designated the question of denominational schools as one of those in which he entirely dissents from his predecessor, Dr. Falk. Government and Church will, therefore, make a united effort to arrest the progress which unsectarian schools have begun to make in Prussia, and re-establish the direct influence of the Church upon the school. A great excitement has been produced among the laity by the demand of the General Synod that the professors of the theological faculties teach in harmony with the faith of the symbolical books, and that the Church, through its representatives, co-operate with the State in examining the candidates for theological degrees. Of course this would mean for the near future the suppression of all but the orthodox tendencies at the theological faculties, and, in case the precedent of Prussia is followed by the smaller Prussian States, would give an entirely different complexion to German theology. The present theological faculties of the Prussian universities greatly dislike this proposition, and the University of Berlin has been induced by its theological faculty to enter a protest against it as inconsistent with the freedom of academical teaching. Another resolution aims at the introduction of a common *Buss-und Bettag* (day of fasting and prayer) for all the Protestant Churches of Germany.

The next General Synod is to be convoked six years from hence. In the meanwhile a Standing Committee will represent the General Synod in all questions in which the Church or the General Synod has to co-operate with the State in questions of administration.

The meeting of this synod may be regarded as a turning-point in the history of the Protestant State Churches of Germany. The period in which these Churches were completely governed by the State is at an end; the new period of a synodal government has now been fully inaugurated in all the Protestant State Churches of Germany. If it is remembered that the Prussian State Church, with which a population of about twelve millions is connected, is, next to the Church of England, the largest Protestant State Church of the world, the importance of the Prussian Synod for the entire Protestant world cannot be doubted.

ART. X.—FOREIGN LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

GERMANY.

Among the important theological works that are announced as being in preparation is a collection of the Greek writers who, in the early period of the history of the Christian Church, attacked Christianity. It will be published by C. J. Neumann, under the title *Scriptorum Græcorum qui Christianam Impugnauerunt Religionem quæ Supersunt*. The importance of these works for a thorough understanding of the early history of the Christian Church cannot be doubted, for they alone can explain to us the reasons which induced educated pagans to reject Christianity. Unfortunately, complete copies of these works are no longer extant. It is not correct that, as is commonly believed, the Emperor Theodosius II., by his decree of Feb. 16, 448, ordered all anti-Christian books to be burned. His decree only referred to the writings of Porphyry, which accordingly were completely destroyed. But all the others became soon very scarce, as they ceased to be copied, and thus are now likewise lost. Fortunately some of the Christian replies to the pagan attacks are completely extant; as the books of Origen against Celsus, the work of Eusebius against Hierocles, the ἀποκριτικὸς πρὸς Ἑλλήνας of Macarius of Magnesia, which has been recently discovered; finally, ten books of Cyril of Alexandria against Julian. These works embrace numerous fragments of the anti-Christian writers; other fragments are found elsewhere, as extracts from Porphyry in the *Præpar. Evangel.* of Eusebius, and in the commentary of Jerome to Daniel. All these fragments will be collected in Neumann's work. The first part will contain the true word of Celsus. A reconstruction of this work has recently been attempted by Keim in Germany, and by Aubé in France. But both have only given translations, not the Greek text. The publication of the latter requires a new critical edition of Origen's work against Celsus, which, therefore,

will be prepared conjointly with the attempted reconstruction of the work of Celsus. The second part contains the fragments of Porphyry and Hierocles. A reconstruction of Porphyry, like that of Celsus, is not possible, because none of the works written against him have come down to our days. The material extant suffices, however, to acquaint us with the plan of the work of Porphyry, and the method of his polemics. The extensive fragments of the philosopher found in Macarius will be given in this part of the work. It is certain that these fragments do not belong to Celsus. Mr. Neumann expects to prove that the philosopher is not, as was assumed by Müller, identical with Julian, and that he must have been either Porphyry or Hierocles. An introduction to this part will sketch the development of the neo-Platonic polemics from Porphyry to Julian, and its relation to Celsus. The third part of the work will embrace the books of Julian. The first of the three (not seven) books of the Emperor can be almost completely restored from the ten books of Cyril of Alexandria. Several new manuscripts of this latter work have been compared. For a restoration of the second and third books of Julian much less can be done, because of Cyril's work the books following after the tenth are lost. All the fragments, however, which are preserved, either in Greek or in a Syrian translation, have been carefully collected. The latter have been copied by Dr. Nestle, in Tübingen, from the British Museum, and will be supplied by him with a Latin translation. Some fragments of Julian are found in the works of Theodore of Mopuestia and of Photius. An introduction to this part will give a historical account of the work of Julian and the numerous replies to it, and will explain the attempt of restoring the book. As it is supposed that Julian's work will interest many others besides philologists, the edition of the Greek text will be followed by that of a German translation.

Another new work on and against the supremacy claimed by the Popes of Rome has been published by an Old Catholic theologian, Professor Friedrich, of Munich, (*Zur ältesten Geschichte des Primates in der Kirche*. Bonn : 1879.) Professor Friedrich, before the beginning of the Old Catholic movement, was regarded as one of the greatest Church historians of the Catholic Church, next to Döllinger. His Church history of Germany was well received both by Catholics and Protestants, and is still regarded as a standard work on the subject. Since then he has joined the Old Catholic Church, and published the best work extant on the history of the Vatican Council. A work from so prominent a historian on the history of the primacy of the Bishops of Rome will be sure to command the attention of the theological world. In the Roman Catholic Church it is now an article of belief that Peter received from Christ primatial powers over the entire Christian Church; that he was the first Bishop of Rome; and that his successors, the Bishops of Rome, inherited his primatial powers. Catholic historians, therefore, however learned, cannot be expected to investigate and discuss this subject impartially. Protestant historians have completely demolished all arguments that have been adduced to prove a supremacy of the early Roman

Bishops over the entire Church, and have even made it very doubtful whether Peter was ever in Rome. One Orthodox German theologian, Dr. Uhlhorn, has recently undertaken to prove that James, the brother of Jesus, occupied a primatial position in Jerusalem, which extended far beyond the Churches of Palestine. Professor Friedrich adopts this view, and this new work is written for the special purpose of proving its correctness. He starts from an interpretation of the seventh canon of the Council of Nice, and shows that this Council forms a turning-point in the history of the Papal supremacy, and that before 325 there is no trace of it. He quotes in support of his theory a statement of Eusebius, according to which Clemens of Alexandria, one of the oldest Church writers, calls James the Just the first Bishop of Jerusalem, and the successor of the Lord himself. A number of passages of the New Testament are quoted as proving that James did, and that Peter did not, hold a primatial position. The first change in the supremacy of the Church of Jerusalem he assumes to have taken place after the second destruction of Jerusalem, in 135, when both Jews and Jewish Christians were forbidden to settle on the former site of Jerusalem. Then the authority of other apostolic bishoprics, especially Antioch, Alexandria, and Rome, gradually rose. The gradual predominance of Rome over the other sees was secured by a number of falsifications and forgeries which are set forth in the book at full length and with great learning. The schemes of the Roman Bishops were strongly aided by the general tendency toward a compact centralization which sprang up in the old Church. The two agencies combined created the Papal system. The work of Professor Friedrich is of a strictly historical character, and draws no inferences from the attempted establishment of historical facts as to the theory of Church government. This will be done in a larger work, which the author is now preparing, and of which the present work is a forerunner.

ART. XL.—QUARTERLY BOOK-TABLE.

Religion, Theology, and Biblical Literature.

Studies in the New Testament. By F. GODET, D.D., Professor of Theology, Neuchâtel. Edited by the Hon. and Rev. W. H. LYTLETON, M.A. 12mo., pp. 398. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co. 1877.

Professor Godet is one of the leaders of the Evangelical non-Calvinistic Protestants of France, and is author of Commentaries on the Gospels, which have been translated into English. His writings are marked by a certain freshness of thought and the lucidity of style in which the French excel, with something of that diffuseness which is their failing. He first, here, surveys the Gospels, and furnishes not a few fine suggestions. He then gives a dissertation on "The Four Principal Apostles;" and in regard to Paul's

predestinarianism makes the following decisive remarks: "There is no trace in Paul of a fatalistic predestination. Human free-will and responsibility are always presupposed and often asserted by him; and as to Rom. ix and x, we will undertake to prove that they contain precisely the strongest protest against that fatalistic predestination of which Israel audaciously made use as a reason for not receiving the gospel."—P. 267. As our own Commentary of Rom. ix is the only one that has taken this decided ground, we would rejoice to know how our French Professor handles the matter. He is copious and suggestive on the Apocalypse. In his exegesis we do not concur; but we are obliged to him for his refutation of the identification of Nero risen from the dead with any conception of the Apocalypse.

The argument for identifying Nero with the symbolic number 666 in xiii, 18, is based on what, if not a true identity, seems a very curious coincidence. That number it is said makes in Hebrew exactly the name *Nero Cæsar* as it is read in the Rabbinical writings. This name seems to have dawned upon the minds of four eminent scholars almost simultaneously, in 1836; namely, Fritzsche in Rostock, Hitzig in Zurich, Benary in Berlin, and Reuss in Strasburg. With a certain class of thinkers it seems to carry all before it. An almost conclusive proof of this name being the true solution arose from a very peculiar coincidence. Irenæus tells us that there were in the then extant manuscripts two different readings of the numbers; the older and more accurate was 666, but a later 616. Now there were, also, two forms of the name Nero, both used in Hebrew; one, after the Greek, was *Nerôn*, the other, after the Latin, *Nero*; and the former of these make the 666, and the latter exactly 616! Should not that settle the question?

To this one might reply that Irenæus tells us that the 616 was found only in later manuscripts, and so they could not have come from John. And how could copyists have adjusted their codices to Nero's name and Irenæus never have heard of that name as a candidate? Indeed, Irenæus' omission of that name in discussing the candidates is a powerful argument against its claim.

But Godet denies that 666 is the true number of the Hebrew name *Nero Cæsar*. Its true number is really 676 according to the spelling in St. John's day. The number 666 is spelled with the three Hebrew consonants K S R; the needed E of the first syllable being supplied by a vowel-point; whereas the true orthography of the word *Cæsar*, as identified by contemporary record, has four letters, requiring the E to be not a vowel-point

but a full letter, thereby increasing the number by ten, making 676. This would entirely destroy the identification of the numbers with Nero. It is, indeed, given up by such rationalistic scholars as De Wette, Lücke, Bunsen, and Düsterdieck. We consider the Neronian solution of this name, like the Neronian date of the Apocalypse, a very plausible, yet entirely preposterous, fable.

There could be no very destructive inferences drawn from the partial identification of Nero with the beast, as symbol of the Roman Empire in its most persecuting phase, if the identification could be proved. Daniel said to Nebuchadnezzar, "Thou art the head of gold;" that is, Thou art the Empire of Babylon. And John could as truly have said to Nero, during Nero's reign, "Thou art the Roman Empire." Just so Louis XIV. could say, despotically, "I am the State." And so in Daniel, followed by the Apocalypse, *kings* stands for *kingdoms*. And as this identification of Nebuchadnezzar with Babylon did not at all affect the shape or nature of the great symbolism of empires in Daniel's image, so Nero's identification with Rome might leave the Apocalyptic interpretation untouched.

But the most untenable, as well as repulsive, part of the rationalistic exegesis is the making John base important Apocalyptic conceptions upon a contemptible whim of the Roman rabble. Nero was driven from the throne and had committed suicide; but the baser rabble, with whom the bloody despot was popular, cherished the hope that he had escaped, was truly alive, and would yet return to the throne. On this John is imagined by these commentators to have founded the image that one head of the beast received "a deadly wound;" that the wound was "healed," that he shall "ascend out of the bottomless pit and go into perdition." That is, the resurrection of the beast is to be identified with Nero's escape and return. But in point of fact the idea of a resurrection from the dead by Nero formed no part of the popular notion even of the Roman rabble at the time of the writing of the Apocalypse. All that the historians of the day or the contemporaneous literature say is that the fancy was current that Nero had escaped, would return, and would take a terrible revenge on Rome. It was not until a later generation, especially of Christians, remembering Nero as *the* typical bloody persecutor, identified him with the Antichrist, and found him in the Apocalypse. Augustine first mentions the idea of his resurrection, and later still Primasius is the first commentator that

connects the idea of a resurrect Nero with the sacred texts. And that furnished a notable mare's nest for modern rationalism.

Gebhardt, admitting this discordance between John's conception of the beast's resurrection and the Neronian rumor of a mere *return*, nevertheless maintains that John modifies the rumor to his own purposes. The modification, we reply, is much the largest part of the modified subject. And if the nucleus was a miserable falsity, the modification enlarges it to an enormity. We cheerfully admit that John does often take a nucleus of fact and modify it to his own needs. We may admit that chap. xii abounds in such modifications. But we call attention to the most decisive fact, that *every nucleus John appropriates for such modification in his Apocalypse is drawn from the sacred records*. Hengstenberg has well shown, in discussing another point, that John never goes to classic or profane literature for any of his conceptions. He forcibly denies on that ground that the "palms" of chap. vi are borrowed from pagan customs. All John's imageries arise from within the sacred domain. Perfectly unendurable, then, is the thought that John goes to the slums of Rome and picks out from the very dregs of heathendom a base *canard*, overlays it with a wretched, lying superstition of his own, and brings it into the sublimest of all prophecies. We pity the moral taste of the man who, on a full survey of the case, does not repel such a notion with disgust.

But there are some points of peculiar significance both in the figures 666 and the combination of the Greek letters that form the number as they present themselves to the eye.

First, as to the significance of the 666: as seven is the perfect number, so 777 would be the trinal symbol of divine perfection, the Trinity. Three *half-sevens* would be the reverse of perfection; the directly bad. Three *sizes* are an attempt to attain or display the divine perfection, but are a failure, a falling short; and that perhaps by a divinely-imposed limitation. And thus in this 666 is numerically figured the antichrist.

And as to the combination of Greek letters that form the number 666, they are in John's Greek text $\chi\xi\varsigma$, that is, chi, xi, st. But striking out the middle letter, the remaining two, $\chi-\varsigma$, are the customary abbreviation in the manuscripts of the name *Christ*. Now let the serpentine ξ crawl in between these two letters, and what have we in $\chi\xi\varsigma$? A central serpent wearing the externals of Christ, a serpent-Christ, an antichrist! Nor, says Godet, must this be promptly dismissed as a puerility. The Orientals were

thus accustomed to express conceptions in figured forms to the eye, as even in our modern West we have our coat of arms, and in our America our stars and stripes. An ingenious, reflective Oriental people, before books were ever printed, were inclined to shape a momentous thought into an impressive mnemonic form. Thereby we get coin stamps, monograms, signet-rings, abraxases, symbols pregnant with impressive import. There is certainly presented here a curious combination of agreements. They are a numerical name, *Lateinos*, that points to Rome; a trine number 666 that suggests the pseudo-divine; and a monogrammic triplet of letters $\chi\zeta\varsigma$ that imports a Satanic Christ. It has taken centuries of thought to unriddle this combination, indicating that $\rho\upsilon\upsilon\varsigma$ has been exerted here in large amount. The reader can decide for himself whether the combination was really planned by the $\rho\upsilon\upsilon\varsigma$ of John.

The Atonement in Christ. By JOHN MILEY, D.D., Professor of Systematic Theology in Drew Theological Seminary. 12mo., pp. 351. New York: Phillips & Hunt. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. 1879.

It is the opinion of Dr. Miley that Arminianism has furnished much less discussion of the atonement than Calvinism. We think it is true that Arminianism has furnished, in proportion to its magnitude in the Christian Church, much less theological discussion generally than Calvinism. The contradictions of Calvinism, contradictions between its different dogmas and contradictions between its dogmas and "the universal common sense of mankind," have kept the Calvinistic mind ever restless and on the stretch for reconciliation. The whole system is like the Irishman's cane, "so crooked that it cannot lie still." Meanwhile we Methodists have held firmly and deeply to the atonement; have sung it in our most favorite hymns, have prayed it in our most fervent intercessions, have firmly preached its reality, and boldly claimed its universality and all-embracing mercy, without a great amount of critical analysis of its precise terms. There was room, therefore, for Dr. Miley's monograph, and that room he has well filled. His work is the result of an extended and searching analysis, crystallized into a very clear and symmetrical synthesis. The language is lucid; its brief and pointed sentences seldom or never obscure, generally even and level, yet now and then rising into a glow, and sometimes becoming eloquent. Our young ministry especially will, we think, find in its transparent pages a great aid in clearing their views and symmetrizing their conception of the whole subject. We recommend Dr. Miley's manual

as a clear and conclusive exhibit of the Wesleyan-Arminian view of the atonement.

Upon the old oppressive doctrine of "Satisfaction," according to which the atonement covered the elect alone with a completed and perfect righteousness, by which they were justified and truly sanctified and saved, Dr. Miley is full and very conclusive. The doctrine usually embraces the absolute absurdity that by intrinsic justice one man can be righteously punished for another man's sin. If there be such a thing as a moral axiom, it is that guilt and penalty are untransferable. The clumsy evasion introduced by some thinkers, that the word *guilt* has two meanings, is here untrue. For what we are talking about is absolute justice and literal guilt, as seen by the intuitive faculty. Such *guilt* is one and sole; and it inheres solely in the personality of the agent in the guilty fact. To foist in here a secondary meaning of the word *guilt* is simply to introduce a gratuitous muddle into a discussion where clearness is an all-important desideratum. That second sort of *guilt* has no real existence.

And when the universal character of *guilt* is fully seen, and due perception is secured that Christ endured not literal *punishment*, but only took upon himself *suffering* for others, the atonement is brought into clear analogy with the course of things in the Providential system. When men are told that Christ was *guilty* of and *punished* for another's sins, the intuitive feeling is that it is absurd, impossible, out of the nature of things; but when they are told that he assumed *suffering* that another man might be relieved from the consequences of his guilty doings, it becomes one of an immensely large class of facts. Indeed, without the possibility of *suffering for others* the profoundest exhibitions of benevolence would be impossible in the world. Our skeptical friends are proud of Socrates. His death as a classic martyr is a thousand times rehearsed. But, with all his goodness and wisdom, to how much less he would amount were it not for his dose of hemlock. He died for others. Without that possibility he would sink nine tenths in the scale. Leonidas died to save his country, and oratory and song have for ages grown rapturous over the deed. But surely the highest ideal would have been wanting had it not been possible for One higher than all to have *died*; *died* not for the good, but for the criminal and condemned; died for those who inflicted his death; died not for somebody else, but *for us*! That is, indeed, *for us*, theme for eloquence and anthem.

A Compendious and Complete Hebrew Lexicon to the Old Testament, with an English-Hebrew Index. By BENJAMIN DAVIES, Ph.D., LL.D. Carefully revised. With a Concise Statement of the Principles of Hebrew Grammar, by EDWARD C. MITCHELL, D.D. 8vo., pp. 752. Andover: Warren F. Draper. 1879.

This Lexicon is founded upon those of Gesenius and Fürst, but is essentially a new work. Though the product of authoritative scholarship, it is adjusted to the wants of beginners. It claims to be at once "compendious and complete," having "over a thousand more Hebrew words or forms than appear in Tregelles' or Robinson's Gesenius, besides incorporating into the body of the work all the grammatical forms contained in Robinson's Analytical Appendix." The "Concise Statement of Principles of Hebrew Grammar" is placed in the beginning, under the persuasion that the better way for the beginner is to forego all intermediate "lesson books," and take to Bible and Lexicon at once, grammar coming in as a felt want to be directly applied. The "English-Hebrew Lexicon" is brought in at the end, embracing about forty-five pages, and contains the English word with a numeral reference to the page and place where the correspondent Hebrew word stands. It thus forms an aid for Hebrew composition. Both pupil and master will, doubtless, find the work a valuable part of the "apparatus."

History, Biography, and Topography.

The North Americans of Antiquity: Their Origin, Migrations, and Type of Civilization Considered. By JOHN T. SHORT. 8vo., pp. 544. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1880.

Though possessing little interest, either as history or romance, the antiquities of our more Northern America have awakened much enthusiasm of late as matter of science. Even as science their investigation scarcely crosses the path of the biblical scholar or theologian, and scarce passes out of the limits of archæology and anthropology. Yet every liberal inquirer must feel an interest in the question, Who and what were our ancestors on this continent? and must feel obliged for this thorough and convenient summary of the whole subject by Mr. Short.

Our Red Indian, whosoever fault it is, persists in being a very uninteresting specimen. His predecessors, the Mound Builders, were better, but not very much. The Cliff Dwellers of the South-west had a slight touch of romance and a very faint hue of poetry to them. As to the question, How came they here?

there can be little doubt that the true answer is, By the way of Behring's Straits. Mr. Short critically examines all the theories, especially the indigenous theory, and leaves this a well-settled question. As to the question of the time of their occupancy of American soil, beyond a few centuries it is all a matter of sheer guess. The trees growing on the mounds are some six hundred years old. Let us then give the Red Indian six hundred years and the Mound Builder six hundred more, and fling in six or seven hundred more *ex gratia*, and we arrive at the Christian era. Fling in a thousand or two years more, and we arrive at the time of Abraham. Sir John Lubbock limits his demand to three thousand years for the whole, and that is quite as much as any known data justify. American chronology, has, therefore, no significance for the biblicist.

Our paleontological friends have had hard grubbing in American soil. From the Floridian jawbone down to Dr. Abbott's drift flints in New Jersey, the geological man turns up a phantasm. They just get finger on his tail, and lo! *non est*. And even had they caught him, how would they show any historical connection between him and any living race? Scientists should not *guess*. Boasting of their grounds of *certainty*, they must give us demonstration, not conjecture nor prophecy. Dr. Dawson, in his "Archaia," twenty years ago stated the probability that *anthropoids* might be exhumed from the depths of our American soil; but anthropoids are not, of course, men. The fox-sized predecessor of our horse was not a horse. Far less are anthropoid apes real men. Man is not only body and life and intellect; he is also *spirit*. *The power to chip a flint does not prove a man*. But, as an eloquent negro bishop once said, "Whoever can lift his hands to heaven and say 'Our Father' is a man." The Adamic man was not only developed from the "dust" below, but endued with the divine "breath" from above, and no development from below, no genetic descent, could have made him an immortal *man* without the endowment from above. The anthropoids described by General Thomas as exhumed near the line of the North Pacific Railroad, with their receding frontals and long dog-like, or bird-like, aquiline snouts, may have been predecessors of man, genetic or typical, without being man. There may be missing logical links, as well as missing generative links, in the process of proving pre-Adamic man.

Our southward advance into the isthmus brings us to a region where archæology rises into something like a glimmer of history.

Chiapa, Guatemala, and Honduras were the home of the ancient Maya race, whose architecture, especially at the ancient capital, Palenque, inspires us with wonder. We are also told, with solemn face, that its antiquity is "very remote;" that its growth is plainly "indigenous," and that traces of "development" are very evident. But its proofs of antiquity are not very frightful. Several very splendid architectures have come into existence and "developed" to perfection in Europe since the Christian era. Christianity created several new forms and styles. There is the Byzantine, which took its rise in Constantinople and attained perfection in the Church of St. Sophia. The Gothic arose some seven hundred years ago, and came to perfection in less than three centuries. The Saracenic sprang from the Byzantine, and produced the Alhambra in Spain. What proof that Palenque is older than Solomon's temple, or Herod's temple reconstruction, or than Diocletian's palace, or than the Moorish Alhambra? Whatever evidences of pre-Adamic, or pre-Mosaic, or pre-Christian antiquity the Maya civilization may present, we do not find them in the architectural remains.

The traditional testimony of the Mayas affirms that they are not an indigenous race, but that they came, as more usually said, from beyond sea and from the East. Mr. Short amply shows how they may have immigrated from the other hemisphere either by an eastern or western route. Especially interesting is his treatment of the Atlantis tradition. Plato tells us that the Egyptian priests declared that there was once a great island on the western coast of Africa connecting with a great western continent, which was submerged in the sea. A similar tradition exists among the Mayas. These concurrent traditions (as we infer) are quite a demonstration, not only of the fact of the submersion, but that the fact took place, partially at least, within the reach of human recollection. Strange to say, the modern sea-depth explorations have confirmed the truth of the tradition. A high submarine plateau runs from the north coast of Africa to America. But, apart from this lost natural bridge, the concurrent trade-winds and equatorial currents are powerful enough to precipitate the mariners' barks from the eastern to the western hemisphere with great ease. In the year 1500 Cabral started from Portugal with a small fleet for the Cape of Good Hope; but, passing the Cape de Verd Islands, he bore westward to avoid being becalmed on the Guinea coast, and in a few weeks found himself on the coast of Brazil. The distance from Africa to Bra-

zil is but about fifteen hundred miles, a voyage none too great for Phœnician enterprise. The problem of immigration from the West is not much more insoluble. The numerous isles of the Pacific served as stages on the way; they were once more numerous than now, many having been submerged even during the human age. They were once populous, civilized, and near neighbors. The Pacific gulf streams even now wreck their sailors in considerable numbers annually upon our shores.

The civilization of Central America is unmistakably Hamitic. Shem was no colonizer by sea, and no architect. Japheth did not develop early on the Mediterranean or Atlantic. But Ham had three great descendants—Nimrod, or Assyria, (or Chaldea); Mizraim, or Egypt; and Sidon, or Phœnicia; and each one of these has had share in setting an impress upon the American civilization. Ham was a sea-rover and a colonizer, and would easily cross to Chiapa; he was a builder, especially in pyramids, and could readily have founded Palenque and Cholula. He was, like the Mayas, a sun-worshiper, a Molochian offerer of human victims. He bore the deluge tradition and the *cruz ansata* to America. His Egyptian orientation and terracing of the pyramids are there. Thither Phœnicia has sent her serpent and her cosmogonical egg. Assyria has sent thither her "sun symbol," her bearded tree-worshipers, and her outspread sun-wings. Yet it is not so much from Egypt that America has imported her pyramids, which in fact are hardly true pyramids. Her truncated structures came from Babel and Babylon; are partially derived from the Jupiter Bel or Baal temples. In fact, these architectures almost seem to have traveled from Shinar eastward, and to have come round to America across the Pacific. So great a master of comparative architecture as Ferguson affirms that Burmah borrowed her architecture from Babylon; that farther east than Burmah the ruined cities of Cambodia show *teocallis* (pyramidal sanctuaries) like those of Mexico and Yucatan. Ferguson (as quoted by M'Causland) says, "As we advance eastward from the Valley of the Euphrates, at every step we meet with forms of art becoming more and more like those of Central America;" adding that but for the geographical difficulty no doubt would exist of the derivation of the American architecture from that origin—a difficulty amply solved by Mr. Short.

One record of the Mosaic deluge tradition Mr. Short finds so deeply imbedded in the native history that it cannot be rejected as an appropriation from the Christian missionaries without in-

validating all existing Central American history. He summarizes the tradition in these words: "In a preceding chapter we have given the deluge tradition from Ixtilxochitl, who states that the waters rose *fifteen cubits* (caxtolmoletltli) above the highest mountains, and that a few escaped in a close chest, (toplipetlacali,) and after men had multiplied they erected a very high *zacuali*, or tower, in order to take refuge in it should the world be again destroyed. He further states that then their speech was confused, so that they could not understand each other, and that they dispersed to different parts of the earth." But the story of sending out three birds as weather explorers is, he thinks, so transparent an appropriation that he can hardly name it with "gravity." Change the names of the birds, and you have just Moses over again. And yet this very story is found, fully detailed, in the Assyrian account, as given by both Smith and Lenormant; and if here aboriginal, is, beyond all question, derived not from Moses but from Assyria. How can Mr. Short reasonably reject this striking passage as too servilely biblical, and yet accept the "fifteen cubits" as aboriginal? Though Lenormant half yields the bird tradition to the higher criticisms of Ramirez, we do not; for where one crucial passage of the flood-tradition is fully admitted there is a fair presumption in favor of other passages, which should check hypercriticism. The existence, also, of two records from distant quarters of the same passage, establishes a favorable presumption for the third. There is a valid probability that Assyria, Palestine, and America possess three copies of the same bird-tradition. And this is all confirmed by the fact that the courier birds of the flood so impress the human mind that they are constantly reappearing in the various traditions. Lenormant finds them in the Iranian tradition in Asia; the dove and olive branch are seen on the Arkite symbols at Apamea, Phrygia; and even among the Chippeway Indians Menabosha (which Lenormant suspects to be the Aryan Manu Vaivasvata) sends a bird out of his bark to know if land be dry, and thus restores our race.

Mr. Short quotes a document to disprove the common statement that the pyramid of Cholula is connected with the Tower of Babel. Our own conclusion is that his document, if admitted as good authority, confirms that connection. The document is simply a verbal narrative uttered by an old inhabitant of Cholula, and recorded by Father Duran, A. D. 1585. The story is, that creation being not quite completed, and the land being "all a plain without hill or elevation, *encircled in every part by water*,

without tree or created thing," certain giants, fascinated with the glory of the new-made sun, endeavored to find his secret place of setting and rising. Defeated in their attempt, (the narrator says,) "they determined to build a tower so high that its summit *should reach the sky*. Having collected material for the purpose, they found a *very adhesive clay and bitumen*, with which they speedily commenced to build the tower, and having reared it to the greatest possible altitude, so that they say it reached to the sky, the Lord of the Heavens, enraged, said to the inhabitants of the sky, 'Have you observed how they of the earth have built a high and haughty tower to mount hither, being enamored of the light of the sun and his beauty? Come and confound them, because it is not right that they of the earth, living in the flesh, should *mingle with us*.' Immediately, at that very instant, the inhabitants of the sky sallied forth like flashes of lightning; they destroyed the edifice, and divided and *scattered its builders to all parts of the earth*." If criticism admits this as a true aboriginal document, Cholula is a second edition of Babel. The remarkable specialty "clay and bitumen" is a crucial proof. We then have the "tower," the purpose of building to the sky, the bituminous material, the parley of Jehovah in heaven, the defeat of the tower, and the *dispersion* of the builders through the earth. All this in a series of biblical phrases. The flood is, indeed, in the background. From a deluge by rain it has become a quiet submergence in the incompleteness of the creation. We submit that Cholula is Babel Junior.

Lectures on Electricity in its Relations to Medicine and Surgery. By A. D. ROCKWELL, A.M., M.D., Electro-Therapeutist to the New York State Woman's Hospital, Member of the American Neurological Association, Fellow of the New York Academy of Medicine. 8vo., pp. 100. New York: Wm. Wood & Co.

This little volume, from the pen of this well-known and prolific writer on the subject of electricity in its various applications for the alleviation and cure of disease, although addressed to, and especially intended for, the medical profession, commends itself to the general public as a concise exposition of the advances which have been made in the medical use of this subtle and mysterious agent within the past few years. Soon after the method of exciting electricity by friction was discovered, attempts were made by educated physicians to apply this powerful agent to the cure of disease, but with so little success that these attempts were finally abandoned by regular practitioners of medicine.

Similar attempts followed the discovery of Galvanic and Faradic electricity, and with similar results.

It was found that these agents were powerful in their influence on the human system, but that their employment was quite as likely to injure as to benefit the patient. The scientific principles on which their successful use necessarily depends had not yet been studied out. Unscrupulous charlatans, however, found in electricity exactly what suited their methods of practice. By its use they made a profound impression, and now and then a marvelous cure. If they failed to benefit the great majority of their patients, and injured many more than they cured, they ignored their failures and boasted of their successes in such manner as to build up their own fortunes at the expense of their unfortunate patrons. This employment of electricity by charlatans served to bring its use in medicine still more into discredit than the failures of honest practitioners had before done.

Within the past few years, however, many well-educated physicians have been engaged in an honest, laborious, and thoroughly scientific investigation of the subject; and they have succeeded in studying out the principles in accordance with which electricity must be applied in order to make it uniformly of service as a remedial agent. Brilliant successes in practice have been the results of these studies. Duchenne and Remak in Europe, and Beard and Rockwell in this country, have been foremost in discovering and elucidating the principles in accordance with which electricity may be made a powerful remedial agent—Duchenne by his investigations regarding the localized use of Faradic electricity, Remak regarding the localized use of Galvanic electricity, and Beard and Rockwell by their studies and discoveries on the employment of general faradization, through which remarkable tonic effects are obtained, and of central galvanization, through which the brain and spinal cord are directly and beneficially influenced.

There can be no doubt, then, that electricity, as a remedial agent, is now as thoroughly understood as is any other remedy. Indeed, there would seem to be greater difference of opinion regarding the efficacy and proper use of drugs than in regard to the use of electricity as taught by the masters above mentioned. But it should be mentioned that even physicians make signal failures in the use of electricity as a remedy, until to a knowledge of anatomy and physiology and the general science of medicine, they add a special knowledge of the science of electricity, and much

study and experience in its medical use. Hence it is that although the Lectures of Dr. Rockwell are of great interest to the general reader, their perusal will in no wise justify him in undertaking or advising the employment of this powerful remedy without the direction and advice of a competent physician.

History of the Christian Church from its Origin to the Present Time. By WILLIAM BLACKBURN, D.D., Professor of Church History, Chicago. 8vo., pp. 719. New York: Phillips & Hunt; Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. 1879.

This magnificent volume is a not unsuccessful attempt to present Church history, with a living spirit, in a continuous readable style, so as to be easily contemplated as a comprehensive whole. It is written from the evangelical stand-point; and as regards the line that divides the evangelical Church into two doctrinal sections, by the predestinarian dogma, it is written, so far as we can judge, in a spirit of entire fairness. It begins from the apostolic founding of the Church, and ends with the present hour. It gives a completer sketch of the American Churches than any we have seen, and thereby suggests a repetition of what we have formerly said, that it is quite time that some scholarly men or set of men should give, in one or more volumes, a complete view of American theology as a whole. Dr. Blackburn has constructed several charts, or rather what might be called *maps in theological geography*, which present a great deal of history in a single page in an impressive and suggestive manner.

When the Wesleyan Arminian writes a Church history from his own specific stand-point, he will refuse to brand the essential Arminians of the Western Church in the Middle Ages with the epithet "Semi-Pelagian." They were neither Semi-Pelagian nor Semi-Augustinian; but were the true continuation of the primitive orthodoxy of the first three centuries, from which Augustinianism and Pelagianism were opposite aberrations. It was the earliest theology, and is bound to be the latest. Pressensé truly says that predestination was to the early Church a heresy, and Richard Watson well defines his Arminianism as being neither Augustinian, on one hand, nor Pelagian on the other. There never was an Augustinian Church until after the Reformation; and then came Calvinism, more Augustinian than Augustine, black fatalism itself.

The style of Dr. Blackburn is animated and often graphic, but wanting in graceful flow, abrupt, with occasional solecisms. Thus he says of Vincent of Lerius (misprinted Lerijs) "his little

'History of Heresies' does not contain his own name as that of a heretic, for *he thought himself sound*! Of Faustus he says, "Pope Gelasius *put him and Cassian down* in the first Index of Prohibited Books." Page 697 says that Asbury "preached in private circles for a year, while Garrettson was flogged," etc. Our Bishops "itinerate, and are elected by the General Conference." We thought their election came before the itinerating. The following characterization of Dr. Olin is, we think, extravagant. "His successor, Dr. Stephen Olin, so attached to the Greek Testament, at home or in his tent by the Jordan, gave to Methodism a vigor which is manifest in ethical, scientific, theological, historical, biblical, and cyclopedic literature, thus holding fair rivalry with denominations which are credited with an earlier inheritance of scholarship." This is far from true of any one man among us, but nearer truth of Dr. Fisk than of Dr. Olin. Yet the sentence is good proof of the intentional fairness and liberality of the writer.

The History of England from the Accession of James the Second. By LORD MACAULAY. 8vo., pp. 609. Vol. I. Set of five volumes. New York: Harper & Bros. 1879.

The Rise of the Dutch Republic. A History. By JOHN LOTHROP MOTLEY, D.C.L., LL.D., Corresponding Member, etc. 8vo., pp. 579. Vol. I. Set of three volumes. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1879.

These two stately sets upon our table from the Harper press are, of course, a necessary requisite for the completion of every historic library. Full tributes to each of these historians have lately been paid in our pages in articles from able pens. The histories are both written in the same modern spirit, detailing narratives of events impregnate with the modern spirit of enlightenment and advance. The Dutch history presents the development of a Republic in striking analogy with our own, but really advancing to a stage equivalent to our Confederacy before the formation of our national Constitution. This was owing to the death of that great hero, whose living character so remarkably resembled our Washington, and whose martyrdom by the hand of an assassin suggests our Lincoln. But while the Dutch history presents an analogy to our own, the English is truly and literally our own. For we are English, and not Dutch, and English history is the earlier part of our own history; and while in Motley we are among crude but genuine Republicans, yet they are comparatively strangers, with foreign faces and odd, pedantic Dutch-Latin names; whereas, in Macaulay, we are among old acquaintances, historically pioneering our own historic course, with our own

faces in more beefy condition, talking our own language, and bearing our own or cognate names. We take our place on that wide area which an Englishman has called "the greater Britain," on whose wide and widening territory the language of Chatham and Daniel Webster is spoken. What a grandeur it is that a Macaulay and a Motley are able to address with proud acceptance so world-wide an audience!

Life of Rev. Thomas Brainerd, D.D., for Thirty Years Pastor of Old Pine-street Church, Philadelphia. By M. BRAINERD. 12mo., pp. 455. New York: A. D. F. Randolph. Price, \$2.

It was about the year 1825 that Thomas Brainerd presented himself to be a scholar at Mr. Grosvenor's Academy at Rome, New York. With some rural traits in his appearance and style, he soon exhibited a manliness of port, a vigor of intellect, and a freedom of utterance easily rising into a flow of oratory, that commanded all respect. He was going to be a lawyer, a politician, a statesman, with an unlimited ambition. But in the good providence of God his path was intersected by Charles G. Finney. In a revival of most marvelous sweep, under the early ministrations of that wonderful evangelist, Brainerd was arrested, and a most unexpected turn was given to his life. It was not a change of ambition. It was an agonized surrender of his ambition to his sense of duty. He studied theology at Andover, and his clear ability soon brought him into association with such men as Lyman Beecher, Albert Barnes, and Charles G. Finney. The earlier part of his ministry was spent in Cincinnati, but during the many years of his maturer life he was one of the ecclesiastical "powers that be" of Philadelphia. His memoir, from the hand of his surviving widow, Mrs. Mary Brainerd, evinces how well he had chosen his partner in life. Eminent as was his career, it was not more eminent than was expected by his academic comrade.

Protestantism in Michigan: Being a Special History of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and Incidentally of Other Denominations. By ELIJAH H. PILCHER, D.D. Illustrated. 8vo., pp. 464. Detroit: R. D. S. Tyler & Co.

Upon a history of Methodism and Protestantism generally in Michigan, Dr. Pilcher has been engaged, as time allowed, for twenty years, and has been enabled to bring his work to great fullness and apparent accuracy. It will be very acceptable to thousands, of the Peninsular State especially; and will form a very interesting and valuable part of the permanent religious history of both our Church and country. The narrative of the early

start of Methodism in old French Catholic Detroit is very interesting. A hard soil it was; very hard, indeed, as is attested by the utter failure, in the first attempts, by such men as Nathan Bangs and William Case. The numerous personal sketches give piquancy and point to the narrative. At every advance we are cheered with advancing victory. The engravings recall to our memory the face of many a departed, or still living, friend. Eminent in the history, justly and truly, as early pioneer and faithful, loyal, and stalwart pillar, is the author, Dr. Pileher himself.

The Conflict of Christianity with Heathenism. By Dr. GERARD UHLHORN, Abbot of Loccum, and Member of the Supreme Consistory in Hanover. Edited and Translated with the author's sanction from the Third German Edition by EGBERT C. SMITH and C. J. H. ROPES. 12mo., pp. 508. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1879.

A more precise title for this volume would be: A History of the Overthrow of Paganism in the Roman Empire by Christianity. It begins with the reign of Augustus, and extends to the total defeat of the last effort of paganism with the death of Julian. It consequently unfolds the greatest revolution in the history of mankind. And ecclesiastical history, if such purely it can be called, has seldom been clothed in so living a style. We have not the statistical dryness of Mosheim, nor the perpetual sarcasm of Gibbon, nor the dreamy diffuseness of Neander; but great events, characters, and principles portrayed with a fresh and vigorous power. It is written with a thoroughness of scholarship to satisfy the scholar, yet with a zest of spirit and a freedom of style that suit it for the popular reader.

The History of England, from the Invasion of Julius Cæsar to the Revolution in 1688. By DAVID HUME, Esq. A New Edition, with the Author's Last Corrections and Improvements, to which is prefixed a Short Account of His Life, Written by Himself. In six volumes. (In a box.) 8vo. Vol. I, pp. 644. Vol. II, pp. 652. Vol. III, pp. 613. Vol. IV, pp. 587. Vol. V, pp. 569. Vol. VI, with Index, pp. 527. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1879.

Hume's history is old, but not quite obsolete. Criticism has invalidated many of its statements, and present public thought largely rejects his general views of England's history, in which he strangely contrived to unite the bigotry of a high Tory with the looseness of a freethinker. Charles Fox said that "Hume so loved a king and Gibbon so hated a priest, that neither could be trusted where a king or a priest was concerned." That Hume is, in spite of all drawbacks, demanded for re-publication, is proof of the great intellect of the man.

History of the Rise of the Huguenots of France. By HENRY M. BAIRD. 8vo. Vol. I, pp. 577. Vol. II, with Index, pp. 681. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1879.

Our readers are familiar with productions in our pages from Professor Baird's classic pen. The present work is, doubtless, a labor of love, portraying the tragic history of his spiritual and personal ancestry, the French Huguenots. The present volume traces their rise, and closes with an epic fitness with the memorable massacre of St. Bartholomew. The author has had access to a large amount of sources shedding new light on the history. A fuller review may be expected in our Quarterly.

History of the United Netherlands from the Death of William the Silent to the Twelve Years' Truce—1609. By JOHN LOTHROP MOTLEY, D.C.L., LL.D. In four volumes. (In a box.) With Portraits. 8vo. Vol. I, pp. 532. Vol. II, pp. 563. Vol. III, pp. 599. Vol. IV, with Index, pp. 632. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1879.

The Life and Death of John of Barneveld, Advocate of Holland. With a View of the Primary Causes and Movements of the Thirty Years' War. By JOHN LOTHROP MOTLEY, D.C.L., LL.D. In two volumes. With Illustrations. (In a box.) 8vo. Vol. I, pp. 389. Vol. II, with Index, pp. 475. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1879.

These new and handsome editions of Motley, neatly boxed up and freshly issued, will be very acceptable to the reading public. Both have been amply reviewed in our Quarterly, and they only need announcement.

Educational.

A New Latin Dictionary. Founded on the Translation of Freund's Latin-German Lexicon, edited by E. A. ANDREWS, LL.D. Revised, enlarged, and in great part re-written, by CHARLTON T. LEWIS, Ph.D., and CHARLES SHORT, LL.D. 4to, pp. 2019. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1879.

The best German and American scholarship is embodied in this work. And the American contributions, by both the late Professor Andrews and Professors Lewis and Short, have brought it with an admirable completeness to the latest dates. For, strange as it may seem to some, "progress" is as rapid and real (though not as flaring) in Latin lexicography as in other departments of thought. The following paragraph will suggest to our readers something of the nature of this progress:

Great advances have been made in the sciences on which lexicography depends. Minute research in manuscript authorities has largely restored the texts of the classical writers, and even their orthography. Philology has traced the growth and history of thousands of words, and revealed meanings and shades of meaning which were long unknown. Syntax has been subjected to a profounder analysis. The history of ancient nations, the private life of their citizens, the thoughts and be-

liefs of their writers, have been closely scrutinized in the light of accumulating information. Thus the student of to-day may justly demand of his lexicon far more than the scholarship of thirty years ago could furnish. The present work is the result of a series of earnest efforts by the publishers to meet this demand.

We expect a full review of the work from the hand of an amply competent scholar.

♦♦♦

Literature and Fiction.

Literary Studies. By the late WALTER BAGEHOT. With a Prefatory Memoir. Edited by RICHARD HOLT HUTTON. Two volumes. London: Longmans & Green. 1879.

To most American readers Mr. Walter Bagehot, who died some two years since, was known only as a writer on politics and finance. His books on these subjects, "Lombard Street," "Physics and Politics," and "The English Constitution," were reprinted in this country, and the last named is used, we believe, as a text-book in several of our colleges. But these two volumes show that as a literary critic Mr. Bagehot had abilities of the very first order. A part of these essays were first collected into a volume some twenty years ago; and we are inclined to agree with Mr. Hutton, the editor of this edition, that "the literary taste of England never made a greater blunder than when it passed by that remarkable volume of essays with comparatively little notice." The essays are a series of studies upon the lives and work of some of the greatest English writers, including Shakspeare, Milton, Gibbon, Butler, Cowper, Shelley, Scott, Thackeray, and a half dozen others. What is first noticeable in them is their freshness of manner and wholly unconventional tone. Both in matter and in style they are delightfully original. It is a common observation that studious men, even though writers by profession, write dull books. They have knowledge and opinions, but they lack the art to communicate them. As has been wittily said, their hard reading is the cause of their writing what is hard to read. If one is to get the ear of the world, one must have the speech of the world; and this is not to be learned in the closet. In particular, the literary criticism of a professed critic is often tiresome reading; it is over subtle, and sometimes seems to be written in a kind of technical dialect. But Mr. Bagehot was a banker. And he wrote like a banker—which is as much as to say that, in most respects, he wrote exceeding well. The shrewd sense, the varied experience of men and things, the racy vigor and curtness of speech, the ready and pungent wit, the homely and striking illustration, these all mark the man of the street rather than of the study.

Not that these essays show any lack of wide reading, or of keen critical insight. On the contrary, the range of Mr. Bagehot's reading and the catholicity of his taste are surprising. He wrote almost equally well of Beranger's Songs and of Butler's Analogy; and the pithy criticism upon men of widely different ages which is scattered incidentally through these volumes—upon Homer, Plato, Voltaire, Dante, Goethe, and Dryden, for example—show that he had somehow found time to familiarize himself with what is best in all the great European literatures. But his reading did not warp his originality nor make him bookish. Upon the most well-worn themes—Shakspeare, for instance—he had something new to say, and a fresh and forcible way of saying it. Few collections of essays contain so little second-hand opinion, so much that is new and yet true.

As for his acumen we have seen nothing in recent English criticism to equal it. But it never led him into fanciful or laborious analysis. It was constantly held in check by the practical temper of his thought. To use a phrase he was fond of, he could always tell you what a thing "came to;" and that is the office of criticism. By its easy rapidity, its manifold suggestiveness, and its versatility, the writing of Mr. Bagehot reminds one of that rare thing, the talk of a really good talker. It is uncommon to find so much depth and power of thought combined with such vigorous plainness of expression and felicity of illustration. Indeed, Mr. Bagehot seemed sometimes curiously rather afraid of his own penetration. After stating some principle of conduct or opinion discovered in the life or writings of the author under criticism, he had a way of saying, "Now, this may seem to many people like nonsense, but in reality it isn't. For,"—and then would follow some homely but conclusive examples of the principle in common life.

It is largely to this union of the speculative and the practical temper that we ascribe the humor which constantly played about Mr. Bagehot's pen. For humor, if any thing more than easy good-fellowship or the gush of animal spirits, depends upon the quick perception of contrasted relations. And this perception Mr. Bagehot had in a remarkable degree. The philosopher and the banker in him were always laughing at each other. Very suggestive of the nature and the source of his humor is such a passage as this:—

There seems an unalterable contradiction between the human mind and its employments. How can a *soul* be a merchant? What relation to an immortal being have the price of linseed, the fall of butter, the tare on tallow, or the brokerage

on hemp? Can an undying creature debit "petty expenses" and charge for "carriage paid?" All the world's a stage;—"the satchel and the shining morning face,"—the "strange oaths,"—the "bubble reputation,"—the

Eyes severe and beard of formal cut,
Full of wise saws and modern instances.

Can these things be real? Surely they are acting. What relation have they to the truth as we see it in theory? What connection with our certain hopes, our deep desires, our craving and infinite thought? "In respect of itself, it is a good life; but in respect it is a shepherd's life, it is naught." The soul ties its shoe; the mind washes its hands in a basin. All is incongruous.

The essays are remarkably even. If we mistake not, however, those which deal largely with the relations of philosophy and religion to practical life are written with greater zest than the others. Those on Huxley, Coleridge, Arthur Hugh Clough, and Milton are excellent, but the best of the series is the essay on Butler. We do not remember to have seen in so brief compass such a clear and satisfactory statement of the character and limitations of Butler's work.

C. T. W.

Periodicals.

The Popular Science Monthly. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1879.

This magazine for April contains a translation of an article by G. De Mortillet, in the *Revue d'Anthropologie*, on "Early Traces of Man," written in a very positive style of faith in the geologic man, yet making some remarkable discriminations.

First, it maintains the absolute settlement of the question in favor of the reality of quaternary man. And the remains of this epoch are found as truly in the East, in Assyria, in Egypt, both lower and upper, as in America. It notices with peremptory contradiction the claim made by Mr. Southall that no traces of paleolithic man are found in Egypt and the Orient; maintaining that they have been discovered in positions decisive of their genuine geological antiquity. And of the vastness of the quaternary age he thus speaks: "All geologists are agreed that the duration of the period in which we live is as nothing compared with that of the quaternary period. It is as a day compared to ages, as a drop of water in a stream. All paleontologists understand what a length of time is requisite for the rise and decline of animal species—species which, while they have been upon the earth, have been lavishly distributed over an enormous area."—Page 795. On this we remark that, positive as paleontologists are of this stupendous length of time, the physicists as positively maintain that no such time can be allowed. As yet the physicists possess the field.

But Mortillet is also sure not only of the tertiary man anterior to the stupendous quaternary, but even of the miocene. We do not quote his proofs, our main object being the certain discriminations above hinted. Was the fossil man the complete man of our present humanity? Or was he, in fact, a lower *species*; an anthropoid, and not a man. If so, the Adamic man may have no genetic connection with the pre-Adamite, and our race may have begun with Adam. On this point we adduce the following passages:—

But first let us understand what is meant by the terms quaternary man and tertiary man.

The fauna of the mammals serves clearly to determine the limits of these later geological periods. The tertiary is characterized by terrestrial mammals entirely different from extant species; the quaternary by the mingling of extant with extinct species; the present period by the extant fauna. The man of the early quaternary, he who made the St. Acheul hatchets and used them, is the man of Neanderthal, of Canstatt, of Enggisheim, of La Naulette, of Denise. He is indubitably a man, but differing more widely from the Australian and the Hottentot than the Australian and Hottentot differ from the European. Hence unquestionably he formed *another human species, the word species being taken in the sense given to it by naturalists who do not accept the transformation doctrine.*

Tertiary man, therefore, must have been still more distinct—of a species still less like the present human species—indeed, so different as to entitle it to be regarded as of distinct genus. For this reason I have given to this being the name of man's precursor. Or he might be called anthropopithecus—the man-moukey. The question of tertiary man should therefore be expressed thus: Did there exist in the tertiary age beings sufficiently intelligent to perform a part of the acts which are characteristic of man?

So stated, the question is settled most completely by the various series of objects sent to the Anthropological Exposition. . . .

It results, therefore, from the Abbé Bourgeois' researches, that during the middle tertiary there existed a creature, precursor of man, an anthropopithecus, which was acquainted with fire and could make use of it for splitting flints. It also knew how to trim the flint-flakes thus produced, and to convert them into tools.—Pp. 797, 798.

But if even quaternary "man" was not of the same species with our present man, then there properly is no quaternary man. And inasmuch as even "the man of Neanderthal, of Canstatt, of Enggisheim, of La Naulette, of Denise," is of very questionable character, how do we know that the being intelligent enough to split flints by fire or by tapping had a human form at all, even rudimentally? Quantitatively, the beaver and the bee have as great an amount of intelligence, although qualitatively in different direction. We are, therefore, unable to be sure that the flint-splitter was "the precursor of man." But even admitting his precursorship, he was still an animal, with animal body and intellect. The higher nature, the *spirit*, was wanting. The being may have possessed an animal body, and an animal soul, but have lacked the *πνεῦμα*, the transcendent humanity. For man was not only made

of "dust" and "became a living soul," but he "became" so by the *inbreathing* of the Divine. We are still left, then, on this scientific admission, ample room to deny that the Mosaic history of the Adamic man is contradicted. The view of Tayler Lewis, and later of Mivart, is left unrefuted. Or, rather, we may say that the genetic connection between Adam and the geologic man remains entirely unproved.

The West African Reporter. Four folio pages. Vol. V, No. 68. Sierra Leone. April, 1879.

We have received and looked over with interest a few numbers of this paper that have flowed as if by spontaneity from Africa into our office. In the present number, in refuting the existence of "caste in literature," the editor says:—

Professor Blyden, in his writings above referred to, has been recognized and welcomed as a co-worker by the ablest writers. His articles have been quoted and copied, and what is, perhaps, a greater compliment, plagiarized by periodicals in England and America. The *Edinburgh*, *Contemporary*, and *Saturday Reviews* in England have quoted from and reviewed them. *Littell's Living Age* and the *Methodist Quarterly Review* in the United States have copied some of them entire.—ED. W. A. F.

The *Methodist Quarterly Review* has copied none of Mr. Blyden's articles from English periodicals entire. Our *Quarterly* was the first to discover Mr. Blyden; and his article in our *Quarterly* was the first of his ever published, and, doubtless, the first article in any review or magazine from a man of his race. He has been contributor to our *Quarterly* ever since, and an article of his will be found in this, our January, number. The only article of his ever partially republished from England in our pages was written by him for our *Quarterly*, but intercepted in England and published in *Frazer's Magazine*.

Miscellaneous.

The Lesson Commentary on the International Sunday-School Lessons for 1880. By Rev. JOHN H. VINCENT, D.D., and Rev. J. L. HURLBUT, M.A. 8vo., pp. 252. New York: Phillips & Hunt. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. 1879.

The Senior Lesson Book (Berean Series, No. 1) on the International Lessons for 1880. 16mo., pp. 166. New York: Phillips & Hunt. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. 1879.

The Berean Question Book (Berean Series, No. 2) on the International Lessons for 1880. 16mo., pp. 165. New York: Phillips & Hunt. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. 1879.

The Berean Beginner's Book (Berean Series No. 3) on the International Lessons for 1880. 16mo., pp. 160. New York: Phillips & Hunt. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. 1879.

The Boys' Pocket Library. Volume III. 24mo., pp. 288. New York: Phillips & Hunt. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. 1879.

- The Boys' Pocket Library.* Volume IV. Popular Delusions. 24mo., pp. 258. New York: Phillips & Hunt. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. 1879.
- The Boys' Pocket Library.* Vol. V. Strange Stories about Strange People. 24mo., pp. 263. New York: Phillips & Hunt. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. 1879.
- Conrad.* A Tale of Wielif and Bohemia. By EMMA LESLIE, author of "Flavia," "Elfreda," etc. Four Illustrations. 12mo., pp. 293. New York: Phillips & Hunt. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. 1879.
- Margarethe.* A Tale of the Sixteenth Century. By EMMA LESLIE, author of "Ayesha," "Leofwine the Saxon," etc. Four Illustrations. 12mo., pp. 324. New York: Phillips & Hunt. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. 1879.
- Cecily.* A Tale of the English Reformation. By EMMA LESLIE, author of "Leofwine the Saxon," "Conrad," etc. Four Illustrations. 12mo., pp. 324. New York: Phillips & Hunt. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. 1879.
- The Blossom Books.* (Juvenile.) 10 Volumes in a Box. 4to. New York: Phillips & Hunt. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden.
- The Princess Idleways.* A Fairy Story. By Mrs. W. J. HAYS. Illustrated. 16mo., pp. 124. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1880.
- The Life of Rev. Thomas M. Eddy, D.D.* By CHARLES N. SIMS, D.D. With an Introduction by Rev. BISHOP SIMPSON, D.D., LL.D. 12mo., pp. 592. New York: Phillips & Hunt. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. 1879.
- The Methodist Year-Book for 1880.* Edited by W. H. DE PUTT, D.D. 8vo., pp. 88. New York: Phillips & Hunt. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden.
- Young Folks' History of Rome.* By CHARLOTTE M. YONGE, author of "The Heir of Redcliffe," "Little Lucy's Wonderful Globe," "Book of Golden Deeds," "Young Folks' History of Germany," "Greece," "France," "England," etc. 12mo., pp. 443. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. New York: Phillips & Hunt. 1879.
- Mordecai's Tenants.* By Miss A. D. WALKER. Two Illustrations. 16mo., pp. 142. New York: Phillips & Hunt. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. 1879.
- Glenwood.* By JULIA K. BLOOMFIELD, Author of "Patient Susie; or, Paying the Mortgage," etc. New York: Phillips & Hunt. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. 1879.
- The Young Folks of Renfrew.* (In the Interest of the Missionary Cause.) By Miss M. ELLEN TANEYHILL, A.M., (Mrs. Dr. H. J. BEYERLE,) formerly Preceptress of Williamsport Dickinson Seminary, Williamsport, Pa. Three Illus. 16mo., pp. 239. New York: Phillips & Hunt. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. 1879.
- The Illustrated Catholic Family Annual for 1880.* New York: The Catholic Publication Society Co.
- The Mode of Man's Immortality; or, The When, Where, and How of the Future Life.* By Rev. T. A. GOODWIN, A.M. 12mo., pp. 264. New York: Fords, Howard & Hulbert. 1879.
- English Men of Letters.* Edited by JOHN MORLEY.—Edmund Burke. By JOHN MORLEY. 12mo., pp. 214. 1879.—John Milton. By MARK PATTISON, B.D. 12mo., pp. 215. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1880.
- Art in America.* A Critical and Historical Sketch. By S. G. W. BENJAMIN. Illustrated. 8vo., pp. 214. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1880.
- The Boy Travelers in the Far East.* Adventures of Two Youths in a Journey to Japan and China. By THOMAS W. KNOX. Illustrated. 8vo., pp. 421. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1880.
- An Involuntary Voyage.* By LUCIEN BIART. Translated by Mrs. Cashel Hoey and Mr. John Lillie. Illustrated. 12mo., pp. 200. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1880.
- A True Republic.* By ALBERT STICKNEY. 12mo., pp. 271. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1879.
- Lessons from My Masters: Carlyle, Tennyson, and Ruskin.* By PETER BAYNE, M.A., LL.D. 12mo., pp. 449. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1879.
- Afternoons with the Poets.* By CHARLES D. DESHLER. Square 12mo., pp. 320. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1879.
- The Telephone, the Microphone, and the Phonograph.* By COUNT DU MONCEL. With 70 Illustrations. 12mo., pp. 277. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1879.
- The American Bookseller for Christmas.* 1879. Paper Covers. 8vo., pp. 592. New York: The American News Co.

- Readings from English History.* Selected and Edited by JOHN RICHARD GREEN, M.A., LL.D. Three Parts in One Volume. 12mo. Part I., pp. 152. Part II., pp. 152. Part III., pp. 140. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1879.
- Shakespeare's Comedy of Twelfth Night: or, What You Will.* Edited, with Notes, by WILLIAM J. ROLFE, A.M. With Engravings. Square 16mo., pp. 174. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1879.
- Shakespeare's Comedy of the Winter's Tale.* Edited, with Notes, by WILLIAM J. ROLFE, A.M. With Engravings. Square 16mo., pp. 218. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1880.
- The German Principia*, Part II. A First German Reading Book. Containing Anecdotes, Tables, Natural History, German History, and Specimens of German Literature, with Grammatical Questions and Notes, and a Dictionary. On the Plan of Dr. William Smith's *Principia Latina*. 12mo., pp. 263. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1879.
- Analysis and Formation of Latin Words*, with Tables for Analysis, List of Roots, etc. By FRANK SMALLEY, A.M. 12mo., pp. 87. Syracuse, N. Y.: John T. Roberts. 1879.
- The Egotist.* Essays of Life: Its Work and its Fortunes, its Joys and its Sorrows, its Success and its Failure. By HENRY T. KING. 12mo., pp. 270. Philadelphia: Claxton, Remsen, & Haffelfinger. 1880.
- Plain Talk to the Sick.* By ADAM MILLER, M.D. 12mo., pp. 212. Chicago: Published for the Author. 1879.
- HARPER'S GREEK AND LATIN TEXTS: *M. Tullii Ciceronis Epistulae Selectae.* By RECOGNOVITZ REINHOLDUS KLOTZ. 18mo., pp. 286. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1879.
- FRANKLIN SQUARE LIBRARY, 4to., paper: *The Posthumous Papers of the Pickwick Club.* By CHARLES DICKENS.—*Poems of Wordsworth.* Chosen and Edited by MATTHEW ARNOLD.—*Cousin Henry.* By ANTHONY TROLLOPE.—*The Two Miss Flemings.* By the Author of "Rare Pale Margaret."—*Miss Braddon's Mistletoe Bough for Christmas*, 1879.—*The Egotist: A Comedy in Narrative.* By GEORGE MEREDITH.—*The Bells of Penraven.* By B. L. FARJEON.—*A Few Months in New Guinea.* By OCTAVIUS C. STONE, F.R.G.S.—*A Doubling Heart.* By ANNIE KEARY.—*Little Miss Primrose.* By the Author of "St. Olave's," etc.—*Donna Quixote.* By JUSTIN MCCARTHY.
- HARPER'S HALF-HOUR SERIES, 32mo. *American Ballads.* By THOMAS DUNN ENGLISH, M.D., LL.D. Pp. 155. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1880.
- Tyrol and the Skirt of the Alps.* By GEORGE E. WARING, JUN., Author of "A Farmer's Vacation," etc. Illustrated. Small 8vo., pp. 171. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1880.

EDITORIAL NOTE.—Our last Quarterly contained a biographical sketch of Rev. Dr. Nelson, written by Bishop Harris, containing some remarks upon the "trying ordeal" through which the Book Concern had passed at the time of Dr. Nelson's election as Agent. It is proper to say that in these remarks it was not the intention of either the Bishop (as we say by his authority) or the Editor to express or imply any censure upon the then Junior Agent, Dr. Lanahan, or upon any other person who was engaged in officially moving or conducting the inquiries into the condition and management of the Concern. The only allusion was to unofficial and irresponsible persons who took advantage of the investigations to malign the Church.

TWO PARTS

[Faint, illegible text, likely bleed-through from the reverse side of the page]

1880.

METHODIST

Quarterly Review.

Please Renew your Subscription for the New Year.

Our Quarterly is now more than half a century old, and intends to hold on in its unfaltering career to the next centennial, growing ever younger and stronger as it grows older. Free yet loyal, conservative yet progressive, it maintains the cause of Christian truth amid opposing unbelief; of evangelical life in contrast with rationalistic deadness; of our own historic Church institutions and doctrines in preference to rash innovation.

The form of our Quarterly suggests its permanent binding in a volume. For its size, the volume will be seen to be singularly cheap in price. There are many who have taken it for years who regret not having preserved it in permanent shape.

Subscription Price,	-	\$2	50
Postage,	- - - - -	0	12
Total,	- - - - -	\$2	62

PHILLIPS & HUNT, Publishers,

805 Broadway, New York.